

6084. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of common council of the city of Salamanca, N. Y., indorsing House Joint Resolution 167, to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6085. By Mr. SHORT of Missouri: Petition of citizens of Essex, Stoddard County, Mo., urging the passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, increasing the pension of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6086. Also, petition of citizens of Taney County, Mo., urging the passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, increasing the pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6087. By Mr. SIMMS: Petition of citizens of Farmington, N. Mex., asking the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, for the relief of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6088. Also, petition of citizens of Gallup, N. Mex., asking the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, for the relief of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6089. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of Mrs. W. W. Reif, president of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, West Side, Charleston, W. Va., favoring legislation for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6090. By Mr. SWING: Petition of George F. Mead and 43 citizens of southern California, urging the adoption of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6091. Also, petition of 25 of the citizens of San Diego, Calif., urging the adoption of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6092. Also, petition of Charles Dewesse and 70 citizens of Palm Springs, Calif., urging the adoption of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6093. Also, petition of John P. Lewis and 63 citizens of Santa Ana, Calif., urging the adoption of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, March 27, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Countless are Thy witnesses, Eternal God, our Father; humbled amid Thy glories, may we seek direction in Thy wisdom and in the simplicity of Thy marvelous teaching. At times we desire to do that which is beyond our strength; be gracious to accept the wish when we fail to do the deed. We are Thine; we are part of Thee and Thou art part of our best selves. O teach us to reveal what they dictate of purity, courage, and nobility. Lift the light of Thy truth upon all of us; may it remain in our memories and live in our daily conduct. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EDWARD SWEENEY

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2335) providing for the promotion of Chief Boatswain Edward Sweeney, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy, reported by me from the Committee on Naval Affairs, may be recommitted with the report to the Naval Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, is that agreeable to the Naval Affairs Committee?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I took it up at a regular meeting of the committee.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, what legislation is this?

Mr. HALE. It is a private bill. The bill was introduced by me, was reported out of the committee, but there is an error in the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a statement on the subject of the Reserve Officers' Association.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

Col. WALTER C. COLE,

President Reserve Officers' Association,
Metropolitan Trust Co., Detroit, Mich.

DEAR COLONEL COLE: The pressure of other activities has prevented my replying earlier to your open letter with regard to my address in the House on the current War Department appropriations bill. I am glad to take this opportunity of restating for your benefit my views as contained therein.

In your letter you seem to attempt to refute my statements that the Reserve Officers' Association is a great political force for enlarged military appropriations. Please allow me to quote from an article by yourself as president of the Reserve Officers' Association in the August, 1929, issue of *The Reserve Officer*, official magazine of the Reserve Officers' Association:

"MONEY FOR DEFENSE VITAL, SAYS COLONEL COLE

"The reserve officers of the country are the guardians of our national defense act. They are more than 114,000 in number, representative of industry, commerce, and the professions. * * * An adequate system of national defense is provided for [in this act] in spirit, but not in fact [because] * * * the moneys are not always forthcoming. * * * We know that our protective agencies are far from adequate. * * *

"The object of the Reserve Officers' Association is to support and assist in the development and execution of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national defense. * * *

"The association believes it to be the duty and obligation of its members as American citizens to urge Congress to make national defense a reality and to give effect to the national defense act and the United States naval policy by making appropriations adequate for all the foregoing purposes; and their particular duty as members of this association to aid in the securing of appropriations needed for the training of reserve officers, and to promote legislation in the interest of a more perfect organization in the reserves.

"The reserve officers of the country can provide an adequate system of national defense if they will—one that would stand for all time. They can arouse the citizens of the country to the necessity of a permanent and adequate defense system—a permanent military policy. * * *

"I hold that it is the duty of the reserve officers of the country to so organize through the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States that the association will not only represent the majority of the reserve officers but will also develop a powerful organization that can be used principally for the purpose of securing legislation and appropriations to provide an adequate system of national defense—in fact, one that will stand for all time to come.

"But we must organize. * * * The reserve officers in civil life are executives and organizers. * * *

"We are organized in civil pursuits, for the chamber of commerce activity, raising money for charitable purposes, and many other activities that I could mention, yet, gentlemen, we have only started to organize in behalf of an adequate system of national defense for this country.

"It is our duty and we must turn that organization and executive ability of the reserve officers toward the development of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States—the official mouthpiece for the reserve officers of the country—and assist in the development and maintenance of a system of national defense that will insure the prestige necessary to support our world policies and safeguard our Nation against disaster."

In the January, 1930, issue of *The Reserve Officer*, on the opposite side of the very page that carries your letter to me, is an article by your former executive secretary, now a member of your legislative committee, headed "Our Efforts in Congress Rewarded." The article outlines your desires for increased appropriations and states: "Each member [of the Reserve Officers' Association] should express his personal views on this matter directly to his representative in the House and Senate. * * *

On the floor of the House I pointed out, as the RECORD shows, that Capt. Floyd Newman, of your association, had stated in the *Coast Artillery Journal* of October, 1928, "Another reason why every member of the Officers' Reserve Corps should be a member of the Reserve Officers' Association is that * * * [it] is the only body which Congress recognizes as having sufficient power to demand recognition by them in matters pertaining to national defense. * * *

You and your group, through propaganda agencies, were responsible for causing Congress to appropriate for the Organized Reserves alone during the last five years amounts largely in excess of Budget estimates,

as shown by the following table, giving estimates and appropriations from 1926 to 1930, inclusive:

	Estimate	Appropriation
1926.....	\$3,222,466	\$3,674,800
1927.....	3,667,800	3,721,300
1928.....	3,611,763	4,158,641
1929.....	4,631,927	5,303,583
1930.....	5,201,977	6,110,602

In other words, through letters, telegrams, and other methods you were able to cause Congress to increase appropriations over estimates in 1926, \$452,334; in 1927, \$53,500; in 1928, \$546,878; in 1929, \$671,656; in 1930, \$908,625 for the Organized Reserves alone. And for this 5-year period you and your group were largely responsible for an increase in appropriations from an estimate in 1926 of \$3,222,466 to \$6,110,602 in 1930, or an increase for the Organized Reserves in this short period of \$2,889,263. These figures, to my mind, clearly indicate that you were correct when you stated that yours is "a powerful organization that can be used principally for the purpose of securing legislation and appropriations to provide" for what you term "an adequate system of national defense."

I do not believe it is necessary to add further evidence that your association intends to be a political force in matters of military expenditures. I do wish to repeat what I pointed out by statistics in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that you have had considerable success for some years in getting Congress to increase the appropriations recommended for the reserves by the Appropriations Committee.

I have never suggested that reserve officers as individuals or in an organized capacity had no political right to agitate for any goals they desire. I merely point out the probable consequences of such activity.

The following facts appear to me to be rather obvious:

1. On July 23, 1929, President Hoover said:

"The American people should understand that current expenditure on strictly military activities of the Army and Navy constitutes the largest military budget of any nation in the world to-day, and at a time when there is less real danger of extensive disturbance to peace than at any time in half a century. * * * Our whole situation is certainly modified by the Kellogg pact."

With this went the statement by the President that estimates for 1933 indicated an expenditure of \$803,000,000:

"An increase of \$120,000,000 over the last fiscal year and \$224,000,000 over four years ago. All of which compares with a total of \$266,000,000, the average pre-war total for the combined military services of the Army and Navy, or an estimated increase by 1933 of \$533,000,000 over pre-war."

I pointed out in my address that our Military Establishment now contains at least 689,899 people. This is, of course, entirely exclusive of the United States Navy and the Marine Corps.

2. It is always true that military men and military-minded civilians never feel their military establishments to be adequate. In spite of our gigantic and supreme expenditures and in spite of President Hoover's appeal for reduced expenditures, you and your group still wish to add to our military appropriations.

3. The public and Congress must realize that reduction of military expenditures and the development of nonmilitary means toward peace will become increasingly difficult as the influence of your group increases. If you attain the political influence you seek your organization will be a gigantic stumblingblock to such moves toward peace and economy as President Hoover urged upon Congress and the country last summer and autumn.

4. It usually follows that the advocates of an ever-increasing military establishment attribute to those who disagree with them, first, a lack of knowledge about our preparedness needs, or, secondly, a lack of patriotism. In your article, referred to above, you do precisely this.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations I have had the opportunity for some years to study intimately our military budget and prepare my public statements on the basis of that experience. My position enables me to survey not only your own division of our military forces but all the others as well. It is human to err, but I am prepared to support my statements as set forth on the floor of the House and in the RECORD, and I yield to no one in my patriotic desire to serve this country.

5. The civil authorities of our land were intended by the founders to be in complete charge of its policies—military and otherwise. The fact that your members are out in civil life holding positions of influence creates a problem which our citizenry and our Congress must recognize.

I am not questioning motives, I am not challenging your sincerity, I am merely stating a fact when I say that as military-minded citizens your association can be a dangerous force making for a growing military power. The pages of history show very few cases of military men and military organizations favoring military reductions. They show, on the contrary, that civil authorities have had to be on guard constantly against growing military establishments.

I insist that my record shows a reasonable and consistent effort to keep before Congress and the public the necessity for guarding our people against the growing demands of military enthusiasts for more and more money. That is a service I shall continue to render to the best of my ability.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS A. COLLINS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 27, 1930.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in relation to a bill I introduced providing for the payment of 25 per cent on the basis of the adjusted compensation certificates, and to include a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury commenting on my bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, any hope the veterans of the World War had that the adjusted compensation, commonly called bonus, be paid either in full or in part is shattered by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the bill I introduced. My bill provided for payment of 25 per cent of the face value of the certificates now. Others have offered bills asking that the Government redeem the certificates in full at this time. I contended that the \$635,000,000 now to the credit of the adjusted-compensation fund could be advanced now without seriously disturbing the Treasury, but Secretary Mellon takes issue with my views.

The Secretary feels my bill would require a cash outlay of \$850,000,000, while only \$635,000,000 is available. Probably that would be so if all veterans made a demand for payment, but it is reasonable to assume that not more than three-fourths would request payment, if that many. I regret very much the unfavorable report on my bill, because I feel several hundred thousand veterans now out of employment would not only greatly appreciate but could make good use of 25 per cent of the amount of their certificates at this time. Such money as could have been paid would be used for necessities of life, thus releasing to the business people of the country a large sum that would assist to stabilize business conditions.

The views of Secretary Mellon are outlined in the attached letter to the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee:

MARCH 21, 1930.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 10, inclosing a copy of H. R. 10555, with a request that I transmit to you such comment and information as I care to express in connection therewith.

The bill provides that the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau is directed to pay to veterans holding adjusted service certificates, or who may have made application therefor, 25 per cent of the face value of the certificates, providing, however, that there shall be deducted from the 25 per cent to be paid the amount heretofore borrowed and unpaid by the veteran. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to dispose of the \$635,000,000 invested in interest-bearing obligations of the United States now held to the credit of the World War adjusted-compensation fund for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the proposed act.

The measure proposed does not meet with the approval of the Treasury Department. It reopens a question which, after much discussion and careful consideration, was definitely settled by congressional action; the expedient proposed appears to be of doubtful benefit to the veterans themselves and their dependents; it will interfere with the orderly program which the Treasury Department is pursuing in the gradual retirement of our public debt; and it is actuarially unsound in that it proposes to apply the entire reserve which has been set up to date for the ultimate retirement of all the certificates to a reduction of only 25 per cent of the ultimate liability.

I need not recall to your mind the various proposals and arguments which were advanced at the time this matter was considered, particularly those in favor of and against a cash bonus. Suffice it to say that after exhaustive consideration Congress determined in favor of adjusted compensation in the form of a 20-year endowment policy rather than an immediate cash payment. The choice of this alternative was, I think, based upon sound considerations, since it is apparent that in the great majority of cases a much larger cash payment received during the period of middle age, at a time when earning capacity may well be facing the prospect of decrease, is of much greater practical benefit than a much smaller cash payment received by young men in the strength of their earlier years. Furthermore, the advantage to the family and dependents of the adjusted-service certificate method of payment as contrasted with the cash-bonus method must be clearly apparent. It should be pointed out that the existing provisions for loans upon the certificates are calculated to make provision against pressing emergencies. In any event, all the considerations which led

Congress to determine upon the adjusted service certificate act in the form finally adopted in 1924 apply with equal if not greater force to-day. The Treasury Department is unable to perceive, either from the standpoint of the veteran or of the public, any adequate reason for reopening of the subject at this time.

It is estimated that the bill would occasion an immediate cash outlay of approximately \$850,000,000. While the bill evidently assumes that the \$635,000,000 reserve that has been set up for the ultimate payment of the adjusted-service certificates is immediately available for this purpose, it must be apparent that such is not the case, since these payments would, at best, but reduce the ultimate liability by 25 per cent. Not more than 25 per cent of the \$635,000,000 reserve is immediately available unless, of course, the Congress is prepared to alter completely the purposes for which this reserve fund was established. Approximately \$700,000,000 would, therefore, have to be provided. The Treasury Department could not approve an increase of taxes at the present time for this purpose. The alternative would be for the Government to borrow the money, which, of course, means an increase in the public debt and a consequent disruption of the orderly program upon which the United States Government is now proceeding. A reversal of this program and an actual increase of the public debt by the issuance of bonds for this purpose would be regarded by this department as a violation of a fundamental principle which might entail serious consequences and which should not be considered except in the case of grave emergency.

Finally, I think I should point out to you that while the bill does not purport to do so, its actual effect is to increase the amount to be paid in the way of adjusted compensation. In this connection I think it will be sufficient to point out to the committee that, assuming the face value of a certificate to be \$1,000, \$250 paid in the year 1930 is a much greater value than \$250 paid in the year 1945. The Government actuary has estimated that in the aggregate this measure would add over \$600,000,000 to the total amount to be paid for adjusted-service compensation.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. WILLIS C. HAWLEY,
*Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6120, an act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stats. 630); the act entitled "An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes,' approved May 25, 1926," dated February 24, 1928 (45 Stats. 137); and the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as space for public buildings," approved January 13, 1928 (45 Stats. 51), and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title, and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 23, after "Columbia" insert: " : *Provided*, That out of the money appropriated under the authorization contained herein, at least two buildings shall be constructed in each State for post offices with receipts of more than \$10,000 during the last preceding year, for which post offices no public buildings have been provided."

Page 2, line 23, after "*Provided*," insert "*further*."

Page 3, strike out lines 16 to 25, inclusive, and down to and including "west" in line 3, page 4, and insert: "Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, empowered, and directed to acquire, for the use of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, any land and buildings which he may determine should be acquired within the area bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue and New York Avenue on the north, Virginia Avenue and Maryland Avenue projected in a straight line to Twining Lake on the south, and Delaware Avenue SW. on the east, including properties within said area belonging to the District of Columbia, but excluding those portions of squares 267, 268, and 298 not belonging to the District of Columbia; the square known as south of 463; all of square 493; lots 16, 17, 20, and 21, and 808 in square 536; and lots 16 and 45 in square 635. The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized, empowered, and directed to acquire the necessary land for the extension of the building known as Treasury Annex No. 1, northwardly to H Street NW."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "as provided by existing law."

Page 4, line 17, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$7,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, it seems to me that these are pretty important amendments, and I am not sure but that it ought to go to conference as a matter of fact. I think, however, that we should have a complete explanation of what the amendments mean before the time has gone by to object.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, so far as all these amendments are concerned, except the first one, they have already been before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives and agreed to by the committee, and I have been instructed by a unanimous vote of the committee to ask that the House agree to the amendments.

These amendments were inserted in the bill by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate, and one day when we had a meeting I laid them before the committee, and they were thoroughly discussed.

The first amendment has been put on in the Senate. It provides that out of the money appropriated under the authorization contained herein, at least two buildings shall be constructed in each State for post offices with receipts of more than \$10,000 during the last preceding year for which post offices no public buildings have been provided.

That clause was in the original law, which was approved May 25, 1926, and it means this: That in any State that does not have a town having receipts of \$20,000 or more, but does have towns having receipts of \$10,000 or more, they will have to be recognized by the Treasury Department during the life of this program, and to build them two small buildings.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. HALE. Would that give priority to those places where sites have been acquired?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That has been taken care of in the bill in another place. While I am not enamored of this kind of legislation, yet I believe it will not make much difference in the long run, because every State in the Union is entitled to some consideration, and during the life of this program each State would probably get at least two small buildings.

Mr. SNELL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this provision is already in the original law?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. If it is already there, why is it necessary to put it in again?

Mr. ELLIOTT. This is in addition to the other.

Mr. GARNER. This is a new appropriation, and they make it apply to this.

Mr. SNELL. Then they would get the two buildings for the small places and two more.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Under the original act they would get two buildings, and this would mean two more.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I am trying to find out. Why should we make special provision for those States different from the other States in the Union?

Mr. ELLIOTT. This on the face of it applies to all States but the States that have the larger places, of course, will get them anyway, and I think these small States will get their buildings in any event. There is nothing in the act that prohibits them from constructing buildings in those States or that says anything about the size of the building.

Mr. SNELL. That is all right; but when you go to the Treasury Department and talk about having a building, they tell you that it does not come within the regulations that they have laid down, and if we start making exceptions, why can they not make exceptions for all the rest of us?

Mr. ELLIOTT. But I understand that the Treasury Department has recommended that this be adopted.

Mr. SNELL. Will they make the same recommendation to individual Members who go down there and have special reasons for special buildings in a place that does not comply with their regulations?

Mr. ELLIOTT. When you get right down to brass tacks here is what the trouble is: In those States they have no towns large enough to come in under the regulations of the Treasury Department, but those States all have two votes in the United States Senate, that have to be recognized as being a rather important influence.

Mr. SNELL. And that is what it is for?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is the meat in the coconut.

Mr. GARNER. In other words, there are 12 United States Senators who are going to see to it that as to their States an exception to this rule is made.

Mr. SNELL. I wanted to have that brought out.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. That will not cost the Government a large expenditure, not more than three or four hundred thousand

dollars, but how much is it going to cost the Secretary of the Treasury to do this job you have in the other amendment?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Which job?

Mr. GARNER. Purchasing all of this property?

Mr. ELLIOTT. About \$15,000,000.

Mr. GARNER. In other words, the other amendment provides for the purchase of property in the District of Columbia to the extent of an additional \$15,000,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is not in the amendment. That is in the bill itself.

Mr. GARNER. Then, what is this amendment for?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The amendment the gentleman is talking about is to exclude certain property from the operation of the bill. For instance, the building owned by the labor paper is excluded, so that the Government is not going to take it over, and there are some lots down there under the Pennsylvania Railroad yards and a warehouse. That is what that means. It exempts those pieces of property from the operation of the bill.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Was the gentleman present a few days ago when our distinguished Speaker called attention to what we might term "irregularities" that go with the condemnation of property here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Does not this bill provide for the condemnation of a number of pieces of land in the District of Columbia?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Under this same procedure that is now the law.

Mr. ELLIOTT. But these amendments have nothing to do with that. This provides for the condemnation of certain real estate.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In the District of Columbia?

Mr. ELLIOTT. In the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think it would be wise, in view of the fact that some ten or fifteen million dollars has to be expended for the purchase of real estate, to follow some suggestion with reference to putting into effect new rules and regulations in the way of law, controlling condemnation proceedings, something similar to the suggestion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] and others when this matter was discussed a few days ago?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think there is room for improvement, if anybody can hatch up a scheme that will improve it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think that if the bill went to conference the conferees might provide some kind of a regulation that would bring about a solution of this problem?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No. Under the rules of the conference, we could not reach that proposition under the amendments placed in this bill.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does this bill affect in any way the problem that presents a difficult situation as between myself and the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; it has nothing to do with that.

Mr. RAGON. Going back to the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], has your committee affirmatively passed upon that amendment which was incorporated there on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; we did not on that. But there seems to be no opposition to it.

Mr. RAGON. I wonder whether there was any in the Senate committee?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The Senate committee allowed it to go in on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RAGON. I know the gentleman's committee has so guarded this bill that it does not have a smell of "pork" about it. It seems to me this is the first encroachment by anybody in either branch of Congress—

Mr. ELLIOTT. That same amendment was put on on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RAGON. It may have been put on there on the theory that certain States could not be taken care of otherwise. We did take care of them otherwise, but they come back here and incorporate it again. I am one of the few Democrats who stood with you on that project, and I am in hopes that the department will execute this program faithfully, and I have never heard any complaint. It does seem that we here in the House, men of both parties, with strong support of this bill, should say to those gentlemen who are making these amendments to this bill for pork-barrel purposes, "You can not do that." If it is so, I

think it would not hurt to go over this matter and let them know that there will be strenuous opposition in the House, such as those tactics deserve.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think under the terms of this bill those gentlemen will get relief anyhow. This ought to have passed months ago. The delay has held up employment in many parts of the country.

Mr. RAGON. I do think that the gentleman is making something of a surrender when he does not make some kind of a move to let gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol understand what is due to this House.

Mr. PALMER. Does this bill apply to States having towns with receipts of \$10,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It would only force buildings into States where they have towns with receipts from \$10,000 to \$20,000.

Mr. PALMER. From \$10,000 to \$20,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. I think the building program has been changed so that even cities of \$10,000 receipts will get buildings. Why should there be such discrimination?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say to the gentleman that there is no discrimination under the terms of this bill. They can erect under this bill any buildings that may be necessary, regardless of the receipts, except that the former act provided that in order to be eligible for a building the town must have \$10,000 receipts. That is the law on the statute books.

Mr. PALMER. The States that have towns with receipts of \$10,000 are integral parts of the country.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—which, of course, I do not intend to do—referring to the amendment with respect to the extension of the Treasury Annex, does that amendment contemplate the extension of that annex through to H Street?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It does.

Mr. CRAMTON. Personally, I will not object, but I regret that there seems to be an intention to remove that historic building, the Cosmos Club, sometimes known as Dolly Madison House. The purpose could be accomplished just as well on many other sites, which would not involve the destruction of an interesting historic structure, and we have not many such structures.

Mr. MARTIN. Can the gentleman give us a list of the six States where these buildings would be assigned?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think I can. They are New Mexico, Delaware, South Carolina, Utah, Nevada, and Wyoming.

Mr. MOUSER. I understand that so far the adopted program is being followed and the engineers have been working on these projects. Will these amendments take away enough money to interfere with the present plans drawn and contemplated?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They will not.

Mr. DUNBAR. Apropos of what the gentleman said a while ago, that there should be buildings erected on localities where the postal receipts are \$10,000, it seems to me that a great many Members of this House are being misled as to how this bill is going to operate throughout the country. The amount of appropriations for post offices outside of the District of Columbia is how much?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Three hundred and sixty-three million dollars.

Mr. DUNBAR. I understood the amount for post offices is limited to \$50,000,000. Is that wrong?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes; it is wrong. I do not know where the gentleman got that.

Mr. DUNBAR. Your bill contemplates the erection of how many post-office buildings in towns of \$10,000 receipts or more?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It would not be very many. I do not know how many and nobody else does. But, on the other hand, it might run up into the hundreds or thousands.

Mr. DUNBAR. How many post offices under this bill will be commenced next year?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I can not answer that question.

Mr. DUNBAR. I understood you have appropriated \$350,000,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT. We have authorized it.

Mr. RANKIN. How much would be authorized outright?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Three hundred and sixty-eight million dollars would be the amount authorized outright.

Mr. PALMER. I understand that this applies to six States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Not the \$363,000,000. It is only the amendment that applies to six States.

Mr. DUNBAR. You said this bill authorized \$50,000,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; \$50,000,000 each year until the program is worked out; \$35,000,000 out in the country and \$15,000,000 in the District.

Mr. DUNBAR. Fifty million dollars is authorized for appropriations for the building of post offices this year outside of the District of Columbia?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No. Thirty-five million dollars is authorized for building outside of the District of Columbia, and \$15,000,000 in the District of Columbia; a total of \$50,000,000 annually.

Mr. DUNBAR. Now, there has been only \$35,000,000 authorized for building post offices outside of the District of Columbia this year. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. How many post offices can the Members of this House expect to have built within their districts by an expenditure of \$35,000,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is as capable of guessing at that as I am, because I have no means of knowing what they are going to build this year. They will report that in a few days, and the gentleman will know.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. This amendment was placed on the bill by the Senate. As I understand, two post offices are placed in these six different States, regardless of the postal receipts?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The postal receipts must be above \$10,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Then that will take away from the people in our district, where it is contemplated to build post offices somethings like \$40,000 or \$50,000. That will take that much away from the buildings in some of those places, will it not?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No. It does not take away anything. It puts them in the program along with the rest of them.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. It puts them in along with the rest of them, but this money coming out of the program makes that much less money for the purpose of building in the cities where there are receipts of \$40,000, is not that right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Well, it would not always be done at once.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does this Senate amendment provide for an additional two buildings in each State, so that we may understand now that there will be four buildings in each State, two by previous legislation and two by this legislation?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It would not have any effect on the gentleman's State, I might say, because they will get more than that anyway.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am thankful for that assurance, but I was rather afraid that this amendment was an additional limitation, reducing the requirements as to the first two buildings.

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; it is not.

Mr. HASTINGS. But we understand from the chairman of the committee that there will be at least four buildings in each State?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. Does this affect Pennsylvania in any particular?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Not that I know of.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Has the gentleman's committee ever considered the advisability of building buildings in all cities in the United States that have incomes of \$10,000 or more?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Not more than what has been reported here and what the House has passed.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It does not go down as low as that, as I understand it?

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is nothing in this bill that prohibits them from building a building if they do not have \$20,000 receipts.

Mr. GREENWOOD. But what I wanted to know was whether the committee had ever considered reporting a bill so as to take in all cities?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No. The committee has not.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. As I recall the recommendation of the committee, to build all the buildings referred to would take about \$600,000,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And this bill, if I understand it, is in that direction?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I supported the program and am heartily in favor of it; but, if it is good business judgment to

build buildings where the income is \$10,000 or more, we should go on with the program.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That will have to be settled when the time comes.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Where the receipts are as low as \$7,500 and sites have already been purchased by the Government, those will have a preferential status?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is there any provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to employ local architects to assist?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes. That is in the bill itself. It is not involved in this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not true that the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department would not be allowed to locate these two buildings without the Senate amendment?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; there is nothing in the bill to prohibit it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, the original bill was prepared to be an anti-pork-barrel bill, was it not?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It was prepared to be a bill that would take care of this building program.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Now, the amendment proposed is to make it a pork-barrel bill as to six States; is that the idea?

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will allow the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ARENTZ] to reply to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SPROUL].

Mr. ARENTZ. There are two sides to every question—

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. ARENTZ. I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. ARENTZ. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I hope the gentleman will not object. There is a great deal involved in this.

Mr. ARENTZ. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

So the Senate amendments were concurred in.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 178

Resolved, That the expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency in carrying out the provisions of H. Res. 141 shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts, but shall not exceed \$3,500.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what information came to him showing that the committee expected to use about \$3,500. When the resolution was originally proposed it was understood by me and by the Rules Committee that there would be practically no expense, but there might be a little. As the committee is not to travel outside of the District of Columbia, how does the committee expect to expend the \$3,500?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I wish the gentleman from New York and the Rules Committee had notified me to that effect, because at the time the resolution was introduced I was told they would require at least \$5,000. At that time I told the chairman of the committee that I did not think that amount was necessary, but if he would submit to me some data as to what he proposed to do, how much work he had, and how much he would require for clerical hire, and other things, I would consider it. I did so, and thought the committee could get along on \$3,500. Therefore I have submitted that as the maximum amount the committee may expend in this investigation.

Mr. SNELL. What does the committee intend to do with this sum?

Mr. UNDERHILL. The House had all of that information when the resolution came before the House. I have been trying

for the past five years to get across to the Members of the House that when they pass these resolutions for investigations it will require money. That it was not up to the Committee on Accounts, after the House had practically unanimously passed the resolution for investigation, to question the wisdom of the Members in passing the resolution in the first place, but that the time to kill it was when the resolution was before the House.

Mr. SNELL. I think it proper to ask the chairman of the committee something about the statement that was presented to the committee showing the need for this money, and that is the only thing I am asking at the present time—where this money is going to be spent.

Mr. UNDERHILL. It is going to be spent for stenographers, for clerks, for travel, and for other items which the chairman of the committee probably has at his tongue's end, and he can give that information to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. I think it would be a good idea to get that information from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McFADDEN. I will say in answer to the request of the gentleman from New York that this hearing is proceeding. There is a lot of work attached to the conduct of these hearings, and I will say to the gentleman frankly that the present force of the Committee on Banking and Currency is working every night until very late in order to keep up with the necessary work incident to an intelligent handling of this study. Under the authority contained in House Resolution 141 we are charged with the duty of issuing subpoenas if we want to get certain persons and papers before the committee; and, of course, incident to this are some traveling expenses. There is a vast amount of material that it is necessary to accumulate and tabulate. There is a necessity for clerical help, and in some cases the necessary traveling expenses of witnesses must be paid. It is not the desire of the Committee on Banking and Currency to use any undue amount of this fund. It may not take all of it, but it may take a great part of it.

This sum is simply for the necessary and legitimate expenses for the carrying on of this investigation, which is important, and the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee are desirous that the detailed work incident to the carrying on of this query shall be done properly, and where it is necessary that additional help be had we be authorized to pay for that work.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Did the gentleman submit this matter to his committee, and are the minority members of the committee in accord with him in reference to the necessity of this fund?

Mr. McFADDEN. It is my understanding they are all agreeable to it.

Mr. STEAGALL. I can answer that question. Everybody on the committee desires it.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania told me at the time there would not be much expense attached to this investigation.

Mr. McFADDEN. And I say that now. I do not think there will be, but I think this authorization should be made.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

AMANDA A. RICHMOND

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I present another privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts presents a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 187

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Amanda A. Richmond, widow of James E. Richmond, late employee of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months of his compensation as such employee and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray the expenses of the funeral of said James E. Richmond.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have five days within which to file minority views to accompany the bill H. R. 5646.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the minority may have five days within which to file minority views on the bill mentioned. Is there objection? There was no objection.

NEW HOME FOR HIGHEST COURT

Mr. MAGRADY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article prepared by the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an article written by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] for the National Republic of April, 1930. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGRADY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] and published in the National Republic of April, 1930:

NEW HOME FOR HIGHEST COURT—NATION'S SUPREME COURT WILL HAVE BUILDING IN KEEPING WITH ITS DIGNITY—STRUCTURE REALIZES A DREAM OF FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE TAFT

(By RICHARD N. ELLIOTT, Member of Congress from Indiana; chairman Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, House of Representatives; member of the United States Supreme Court Building Commission)

The Constitution of the United States of America, adopted in 1787, divided the powers of the Federal Government into three parts—the legislative, executive, and judicial. Article III, section 1 of the Constitution says:

"The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and such inferior courts as the Congress from time to time may ordain and establish."

One of our great historians said: "The establishment of the Supreme Court of the United States was the crowning marvel of the wonders wrought by the statesmanship of America. In truth the creation of the Supreme Court with its appellate powers was the greatest conception of the Constitution. It embodied the loftiest ideas of moral and legal power, and although its prototype existed in the supreme courts established in the various States, yet the majestic proportions to which the structure was carried became sublime. No product of government, either here or elsewhere, has ever approached it in grandeur. Within its appropriate sphere it is absolute in authority. From its mandates there is no appeal. Its decree is law. In dignity and moral influence it outranks all other judicial tribunals of the world. No court of either ancient or modern times was ever invested with such high prerogatives. Its jurisdiction extends over sovereign States as well as over the humblest individual. It is armed with the right as well as the power to annul in effect the statutes of a State whenever they are directed against the civil rights, the contracts, the currency, or the intercourse of the people. It restricts congressional action to constitutional bounds. Secure in the tenure of its judges from the influences of politics, and the violence of prejudice and passion, it presents an example of judicial independence unattainable in any of the States, and far beyond that of the highest court in England. Yet its powers are limited and strictly defined. Its decrees are not arbitrary, tyrannical, or capricious, but are governed by the most scrupulous regard for the sanctity of law. It can not encroach upon the reserved rights of the States or abridge the sacred privileges of local self-government. Its power is never exercised for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the judge, but always for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the legislature or, in other words, to the will of the law. Its administration is a practical expression of the workings of our system of liberty according to law. Its judges are the sworn ministers of the Constitution, and are the high priests of justice. Acknowledging no superior, and responsible to their consciences alone, they owe allegiance to the Constitution and to their own exalted sense of duty. Instructed and upheld by a highly educated bar, their judgments are the ripest fruits of judicial wisdom. Amenable to public opinion, they can be reached in case of necessity, by impeachment by the Senate of the United States. No institution of purely human contrivance presents so many features calculated to inspire both veneration and awe.

"The peculiar nature of the jurisdiction of the court requires the judges to be statesmen as well as jurists, and in most instances, tested by the results, wisely and well have they acted. Their decisions are not confined to mere questions of commercial law or narrow municipal regulations, but may involve the discussion and settlement of principles which affect the policy and welfare of the Nation. The court can not consider abstract problems, however important, nor can it frame a fictitious issue for argument to satisfy a speculative interest in the result. It can not anticipate by an hour the solution of a practical difficulty. It deals with the present and the past; it can not put the remedy in force before the right accrues; but given a question, fairly presented by the pleadings in a cause, then, however humble the parties to the suit or however trifling the amount involved, the decision may sweep beyond the petty bounds of local customs or sectional statutes into the broad domain of international law or rise into the loftiest regions of constitutional jurisprudence. The court has always upheld the national char-

acter of our Government and vindicated the national honor. At the same time it has carefully guarded the reserved rights of the States. The most comprehensive and statesmanlike views have happily prevailed."

The first session of the court was held on the first Monday in February, being the first day of the month, 1790, in the Royal Exchange Building at the foot of Broad Street in New York City. Chief Justice Jay and Justices Cushing and Wilson appeared, and John McKesson acted as clerk.

The next term, in February, 1791, was held in the new city hall east of Independence Hall in the city of Philadelphia. The Philadelphia Gazette for February 4, 1791, stated: "The Supreme Court will meet in the new courthouse in this city."

The seat of government was moved to the District of Columbia in 1800 and no provisions were made to hold the court in the city of Washington until two weeks before the time that it was to meet. Responding to the request of the commissioners of the city of Washington, the Senate passed a resolution to accommodate the court in the room in the Capitol occupied by the clerk of the Senate. The room is now occupied by the marshal of the court.

The first meeting of the court was held on February 4, 1801. John Marshall sat as Chief Justice for the first time. The appearance of Marshall upon the bench was an epoch in the history of the Constitution. The hours of provincialism were numbered, the glory and strength of the Nation were to come; and the decisions of the great Chief Justice, in which he explained, defended, and enforced the Constitution, were to shed upon the ascending pathway of the Republic the combined luster of learning, intelligence, and integrity.

The court continued to meet in this small room until about 1808 and from that time until 1814 in some other room in the Senate wing of the Capitol. After the burning of the Capitol in 1814 the court occupied until 1817 the home of Elias Boudinot Caldwell, clerk of the court, at 206 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., in the city of Washington, a building that is still used as a residence. The court then moved back into its old quarters in the Capitol, which had been rebuilt, and remained there until 1860 when it moved into the old Senate Chamber, which had been vacated by the United States Senate, and this chamber has been the home of the court since that time, with the exception of two short periods when it occupied other space in the building while repairs were being made to the court room. The United States Supreme Court during all of its history has never had a home of its own but has occupied for more than 130 years quarters that really belonged to and were much needed by the United States Senate.

These quarters were for many years entirely adequate and satisfactory to the court and the place had the added attraction of being the historic chamber which had resounded in early days with the eloquence of Webster, Clay, Calhoun, and other great statesmen of that period in their controversies which occurred in that historic place. The court room itself has been and is now adequate for all hearings before the court, but the years of progress have brought a great flood of work for the court to handle and the clerk's quarters are cramped; the library room is entirely inadequate; the Justices have to have their offices in their own residences, and the records of the court for more than 130 years of its active life are stored in rented buildings outside the Capitol. During all of these years the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices have gone along, putting up with all kinds of inconveniences and never complaining. Finally Chief Justice Taft could bear it no longer and he began to lay the plans for a home for the Supreme Court that would be ample and suitable for the greatest court of all courts. It has been said that at first several of the justices were loath to leave the Capitol, that they would rather put up with great inconvenience than give up the historic surroundings of the present court room. But when Chief Justice Taft started in to do something he was not a quitter and he finally won out with the court.

His next battle was with Congress. This, however, was more easily won as the Congress had realized for many years that it was high time that the judicial division of our Government should have a home of its own in keeping with the dignity and importance of this great court. The Elliott Public Building Act of May 25, 1926, authorized the purchase of a site, and the block of ground bounded on the west by First Street, on the north by Maryland Avenue, on the east by Second Street, and on the south by East Capitol Street, immediately north of the Congressional Library, was purchased at a cost of \$1,760,000.

The public building act No. 644, Seventieth Congress, which was approved December 21, 1928, created a commission to be known as the United States Supreme Court Building Commission, to be composed of the Chief Justice of the United States, an Associate Justice of the United States to be designated by the Supreme Court of the United States, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol. The commission under the foregoing legislation is composed as follows: Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice of the United States; Hon. Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; Hon. HENRY W. KEYES, chairman of the Senate Committee on

Public Buildings and Grounds; Hon. James A. Reed, former ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; Hon. RICHARD N. ELLIOTT, chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM, ranking minority member of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and Hon. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol.

The commission employed Mr. Cass Gilbert, a noted architect of the city of New York, to prepare preliminary plans, elevations, and models of the new Supreme Court building, which he did, and after consideration and examination the commission approved of the plans which compare favorably in architectural design and in the material selected for the execution of such design with the buildings now forming the Capitol group, and appropriate for the home of the Supreme Court of the United States. The plan takes into consideration the position which the court occupies in the general plan of government, and also considers the necessity for suitable accommodations for the work of the court and the necessary space required for the accommodation of attorneys practicing before this tribunal and for the employees and officials connected with the court in the performance of its various duties. Suitable provision has been made for the future growth of the business of the court, a matter deserving careful consideration.

It is believed that this new building will furnish the best possible accommodations for the future sessions of the court, for its conferences from time to time, and for the accommodation of the attorneys appearing before the court in the prosecution of business brought to the court for its consideration.

It has been the purpose to prepare a building of simple dignity and without undue elaboration, looking rather to the choice of the proper material, to the proper disposition of space, to the general comfort of the occupants as well as to a harmonious addition to the Capitol group of buildings now existing. The sum of \$9,740,000 has been authorized by Congress for the construction of this building. It will face west toward the Capitol, and the main entrance will be in the westerly front. General dimensions of the building are 385 feet east and west by 304 feet north and south. A terrace surrounds the building and forms a setting for it. The exterior design is of the classic type and of carefully studied proportions and simple masses. The Corinthian style has been adopted as the basis of the exterior design, as it is in harmony with the Capitol and is well suited to the character of this building.

The scale of the building is such as to give it dignity and importance suitable for its use as the permanent home of the Supreme Court of the United States. The central section of the building (in which is located the Supreme Court room and the main corridor leading to it) rises to a considerable height above those parts to which are assigned the offices and lesser functions of the structure, thus symbolizing the relative importance of its several parts. The central portion of the structure is four stories high above the terrace on the east front; three stories on the west front; and the east stories are lower in height so that the roof line is continuous.

The plan naturally divides into four parts, namely, the court room, the Justices' rooms, the offices, and the library. In addition to these are certain conference rooms, rooms for lawyers, and rooms for general uses.

The main floor of the building is one story above the terrace. The easterly section of the building on the main floor is assigned to the Supreme Court room, the conference room, the robing room, the chambers of the Chief Justice and of the Associate Justices. The westerly section of the main floor is assigned to the rooms for the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, the clerk of the Supreme Court, the marshal, and for the use of lawyers doing business with the court, and for the press and telegraph.

The Supreme Court room is placed on the main axis of the plan. It is designed to be a room of impressive proportions and monumental style. It will be about 64 feet square, measured from wall to wall, and about 30 feet high from floor to ceiling. The floor area will be about 60 per cent larger than the present Supreme Court room. It will be lighted by windows on both sides opening between the colonnades to the courtyards, as well as by artificial light. This natural lighting is so placed that it will give a cross lighting not facing either the Justices or the lawyers in the court.

The rooms for the Justices, the court officials, and the lawyers are grouped around four courtyards, each courtyard being about 64 feet square. They are approached by a well-lighted corridor system, which connects all departments by direct straight lines of passage, and the several stories are accessible by conveniently located elevators and stairways. The plan is so arranged that any Justice may pass from his own chambers to those of the other Justices for conference, or to the court room, the conference room, or to the library without passing through the public corridors, or may enter or leave the building in the same manner, while he is accessible from the public corridors by a direct well-lighted corridor system, at such times as may be convenient. There are two ample conference rooms with several smaller unassigned rooms located near the center of the building and approached by both the main corridors and the minor corridors.

The second floor contains a law library stack room accommodating 108,000 volumes, 2 special open-shelf rooms for special volumes or

manuscripts of approximately 15,000 volumes, the librarian's rooms, a special storage room for documents in use by the librarian, the Supreme Court reporters' rooms, and 16 rooms for use of members of the bar or for special reading or conference rooms as may later be assigned. As the Supreme Court room and the two main conference rooms extend from the main floor through this story, in order to secure ample height and fine interior proportions, a certain amount of space in this story is required for this purpose.

The third floor consists only of the upper part of the central section of the building and law wings extending north and south therefrom. In this story is placed a large reading room with open shelves and stack rooms for special law libraries accommodating approximately 222,000 volumes. The assistant librarian's working space and cataloging room are provided on this floor.

The ground floor is placed at the general level of the terrace. It contains the filing room and stack room for the clerk of the Supreme Court; large storage rooms for records and archives; dining room and kitchen for the Justices; a dining room for the attorneys, the official staff, and the public; rooms for messengers and pages; rest rooms for women and women employees; room for the superintendent of the building and the electrical staff; telephone room; toilet rooms, etc. There are entrances from the terrace to this floor on each front of the building.

The basement is entered by inclined driveways located below the north and south terraces and leading from the easterly side of the property. The Justices or other officials of the court may enter or leave by this means, and reach their offices by the elevators or stairs, and ample space is available in the basement for storage of motor cars, bicycles, or other means of conveyance. Room is provided for mechanical equipment, fan blowers for the ventilation system, fresh-air distributing ducts, repair shops, rebinding of books, and other utilities, such as are always found needed in buildings of this class.

The building will be strictly fireproof and of the best type of modern construction and equipment, to the end that it shall be efficient in every department. It is not intended to finish the interior of the building with elaborate and expensive marble work and excessive decoration, but to rely rather upon fine proportions with a sparing use of appropriate decoration for the monumental effect which is desired.

It was with the deepest regret that the people of the Nation received the news of the resignation on account of ill health of Chief Justice William Howard Taft, bringing to a close the active part of a great and useful life. It has fallen to the lot of no other citizen to preside over the destinies of the people in the capacities of President of the United States and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He filled both of these exalted positions ably and with a high and conscientious regard for the rights of all of the people; and while he has to his credit a vast number of things of which in his declining days he may well be proud, the erection of the Temple of Justice for the Supreme Court is a monument to him and to his long public service.

His successor, Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, takes his place as Chief Justice with the best wishes of the people of the Nation. He has been an honest, able, and fearless official and jurist and possesses all of the qualifications necessary to enable him to handle the arduous and complicated duties of this great position.

One of his duties as Chief Justice will be to take up the work as chairman of the United States Supreme Court Building Commission which has been commissioned by Congress to build the new courthouse, and no doubt he will see that no time is lost in carrying out this great work. We may expect to see the building completed and occupied at an early day. While it stands may our Constitution stand in unimpaired vigor.

RELIEF OF FARMERS IN CERTAIN STATES

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10818) to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 47, Seventy-first Congress, entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm, flood, and/or drought stricken areas of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Ohio, Oklahoma, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, New Mexico, and Missouri," which is an emergency matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of Public Resolution No. 47, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 3, 1930, and entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm, flood, and/or drought stricken areas of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Ohio, Oklahoma, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, New Mexico, and Missouri," are hereby amended so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make advances or loans to farmers and/or to procure for farmers fuel and oil for tractors for crop production.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment to clarify the language that has been suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture, which I intend to offer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assumed this was just to add Montana to the procession of States, but now it seems to be the desire to widen the language. Will the gentleman state what the effect of it will be.

Mr. LEAVITT. This is to take care of the situation that arises from the fact that the bill, which has already passed, and for which appropriation has already been made, provides for feed for horses, in addition to seed and other things that are in the measure, but does not provide fuel for tractors in the case of farmers who perhaps live on adjoining farms and do not have horses to run their plows but have tractors. All this bill does is to allow the use of the money for the purchase of tractor fuel under such circumstances.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object, but I think the Congress is going a long way in this relief matter. We started in by making appropriations with which they might buy seed. Now, we have this big pork-barrel bill here which has been widened to include 15 States, and we are proposing now to extend it so they can buy fuel for their tractors. I do not know whether the Department of Agriculture can check up on that and know whether they are using the fuel in their tractors or in their sedans in driving around on Sundays.

Mr. LEAVITT. There are very severe penalties for its misuse.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not think we ought to put that responsibility on the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LEAVITT. The department has stated in its report that this is, in effect, an emergency matter and immediate action should be secured.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand that perfectly, and I have seen some other emergency measures come from the Department of Agriculture which later they were very glad to withdraw. If the Committee on Agriculture has approved of this measure authorizing Government money to be lent to farmers to buy gasoline, I am not going to put my feeble judgment up against theirs, but I do question their wisdom.

Mr. ADKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ADKINS. This was considered by the Committee on Agriculture, very thoroughly discussed, the letter from the department was read, and it was thought that in localities such as the gentleman speaks of, where the motive power is a Ford tractor instead of a 4-mule team, the farmer was in a similar financial condition to the man who used a team. One farmer could not operate his team unless he had feed to feed it and the other could not operate his Ford unless he had gasoline to run it. This does not mean any more money out of the Treasury, but means that in such localities money can be spent in this way. Under a reading of the bill it was a question whether the department could pay for gas and oil or not, and there was not a single dissenting vote in the committee to this resolution.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I would like to ask the question whether the sentiment for this amendment originated with the owners of the tractors who were jealous of the Government's attitude toward the farmers who—

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for two minutes in order to propound an inquiry to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] what the chances are for a rule for World War veterans' legislation, which has been reported from the Veterans' Committee.

Mr. SNELL. I am very pleased to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that there is no question in my mind but what World War veterans' legislation will be considered within a very short time. I so stated to the chairman of the gentleman's committee and to the commander of the American Legion yesterday.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, "a short time" is a rather indefinite expression, and I would like to ask the gentleman from New York about how much longer we will have to wait before we get some consideration of this legislation?

Mr. SNELL. I have given the gentleman as fair and as consistent an answer as I can give him, or anybody else can give him, at the present time.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that we are interested in an amendment to the bill that has been reported from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation by which we hope to include the principles of the Rankin bill to extend the presumptive period for tubercular patients and men suffering from other chronic, constitutional diseases to January 1, 1930, and I want to know if when "the short time" expires, to which the gentleman has referred, a rule will be reported to the House that will enable us to take the measure up following the general rules of the House so that we may offer such amendments as we deem proper and not under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. SNELL. I can say to the gentleman that if the legislation comes in under a special rule, we have not drawn a special rule for the consideration of general legislation during the last six years that I have been chairman of the Rules Committee that has not given the House full rights under the provisions of such a rule to discuss the bill and offer amendments, and I have no intention of doing differently in this case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for one more minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not trying to simply take up the time of the House or to harass the gentleman from New York—

Mr. SNELL. I am perfectly willing to give the gentleman all the information I have.

Mr. RANKIN. But what I want to know is whether or not we are going to have an opportunity to take this bill up right away under the rules of the House and not under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. SNELL. If the bill comes in under a special rule from the Committee on Rules, the gentleman will have all the rights he wants under the rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, will it come—

Mr. SNELL. I am not committing myself absolutely, but I expect now it will come in under a special rule.

Mr. RANKIN. And the gentleman could not elaborate on his position?

Mr. SNELL. I am not going any further. I have given the gentleman all the information I have and he should be satisfied with that.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to have a little more definite statement as to the time we may expect it.

Mr. SNELL. I have told the gentleman all I am going to tell him at the present time.

Mr. RANKIN. Because these uncompensated men are dying now at the rate of about 72 a day, according to my best information.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] to the fact that several thousand of these uncompensated disabled veterans have died since we began hearings on the Rankin bill, H. R. 7825, on January 22. I hope the chairman of the Rules Committee will let his "short time" be very short indeed. I trust that he will not delay many more days before bringing in a rule to take up this legislation and give us an opportunity to amend it by inserting the provisions of the Rankin bill above referred to to extend the presumptive period for tubercular men and those suffering from other chronic constitutional diseases to January 1, 1930, in order that those who are now denied compensation may not suffer longer as a result of delay on the part of the administration's forces in the House. This delay is now sending many of them to premature graves, causing many more to suffer untold hardships, and forcing their wives and children, in a great many cases, to appeal to charity for bread to sustain life.

Permit me to repeat that the Democratic members of the committee are not opposing the Johnson bill. It has a great many good features, as far as it goes. But it does not go far enough. It does not extend the presumptive period beyond January 1, 1925, and, in fact, does not extend the presumptive period for tubercular men a single day beyond the limit provided in the present law.

But if this measure is brought to the floor of the House under a rule that will permit amendments, we can then either substitute the Rankin bill or insert its provisions in the Johnson bill, thereby extending the presumptive period for

tuberculosis and other chronic constitutional diseases to January 1, 1930.

That is what we want. That is what the American people desire, and I appeal to the chairman of the Rules Committee and other administration leaders in the House to hasten with all speed to bring in a rule for the consideration of this legislation that will give us this power to amend it and aid us to do justice to our uncompensated disabled veterans of the World War who are now suffering so greatly because of the delay.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10813, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I want to ask the gentleman a question. Is it the intention of the gentleman to adhere to the agreement to confine debate to the bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. LA GUARDIA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNELL].

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, in early days American ships thronged the ports of the world. Our sailing vessels acknowledged no peers upon the seas. But with the advent of steam, our shipping fell off and we looked not outward upon the seas but inland to our vast undeveloped lands. After the World War American wares came in demand. And to-day our factories and farms require a foreign outlet.

To-day, after many experiments, the United States is launching a new movement to upbuild American trade abroad with ships flying the American flag. We had abandoned the principle of Government ownership and operation of ships. But we had decided that if there was ever to be a permanent American merchant marine worthy of the name, we would have to adopt the same measures of aid as those tendered by other countries to their nationals. And in 1928 Congress passed the Jones-White Merchant Marine Act to build up the American merchant marine under private American operation.

The Jones-White Act, not alone promises the swift development of American shipping. The building of ships means more work in American shipyards and the steady and remunerative employment of thousands of idle men.

The initial move under this great national policy to carry the American flag in swift passenger and freight ships to foreign ports will shortly be made. The time is opportune to call the attention of the Congress and the American people to the important fact.

The first passenger ship built for foreign trade under the Jones-White Act, the magnificent turbo-electric liner *Santa Clara* of the Grace Line, will leave Brooklyn, N. Y., my home city, on April 19 next for the west coast of South America, making her maiden voyage in a good-will tour in the interest of American friendship and commerce.

This fine ship is called after Santa Clara County, Calif., the home of President Hoover and Secretary Wilbur.

It is significant that this maiden cruise of this fast and modern new ship, constructed under an act to build up the American merchant marine, will be a cruise of friendship and amity to our neighbors of the south. And it is not too much to say that this first cruise is one of the first definite steps to be taken in pursuance of the Government's plan for the definite and systematic rehabilitation of the American merchant marine under private American ownership.

On her maiden voyage, on April 19 next, the *Santa Clara* will carry the largest delegation of industrial leaders of America on the most important good-will tour of South America since President Hoover's pre-presidential journey. Col. Clarence Chamberlin, noted trans-Atlantic flyer, will also be a passenger and will take with him his new Crescent cabin monoplane for demonstration throughout South America.

Much force has been given the movement to protect and increase the markets of the United States in South America, and the importance of this forthcoming industrial tour is heightened by the fact that Presidents and presidential families, bankers, business men, and leading South American industrialists will

meet the American group in a series of shore trips all over the continent.

The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce will send its industrial director, Mr. Walter A. Peterkin. Borough President Harvey, of Queens, will make the journey. The leading industries of the same borough will be represented.

The forthcoming maiden journey of the *Santa Clara* is purely a good-will mission. A social call upon our neighbors to the southland. Friendship should follow the flag. First of all comes friendship. It is idle to attempt to develop trade in competition with the world without a knowledge of, and sympathy with, your customers.

The time has come when the big American industrialist and even the smaller business man must leave their swivel chairs and go out to the ports of the world. They must get close to American markets abroad and learn the philosophy of the people with whom they deal. We must bolster up and encourage and develop our trade relations with South America beyond mere theory. This good-will mission to sail on the *Santa Clara* can do immeasurable good in solving the many problems which now confront the American business man.

But it was necessary to launch the new movement for the American merchant marine with modern equipment. The operators of American ships must meet the competition of Old World lines that have been established for scores of years. New standards of speed are being established. It is of significance that our first new ship under the Jones-White Act, the *Santa Clara*, will carry the American flag to South American ports in an unexcelled speed schedule. Attaining a maximum speed of 22 knots in trial runs off the Delaware Capes, this new turbo-electric liner, which will clip five days from the New York-Valparaiso run, established herself as the fastest steamship thus far in America for foreign trade.

In 14 tests this vessel made an average speed of 19.58 knots, and in 6 thrilling sprints in the open sea startled technical observers aboard by logging 22.

The *Santa Clara* is 504 feet 8 inches long, has a beam of 64 feet, a displacement of 16,000 tons, a gross registered tonnage of 9,000, and a depth of 37 feet 5 inches from upper deck to keel. Her luxuriously furnished staterooms, all of which are outside rooms, provide accommodations for 170 first-class passengers and her big cargo holds have a capacity of 6,900 tons. Slightly faster than the motor ships *Santa Maria* and *Santa Barbara*, she will have a maintained sea speed of 18 knots.

The first passenger ship built under the Jones-White Merchant Marine Act of 1928, the *Santa Clara* represents the Government's first move for the definite and systematic rehabilitation of the American merchant marine under private American ownership and will carry the American flag to South American ports in an unexcelled speed schedule. As you know the Government defrays three-fourths of the cost of ships built under the provisions of the Jones-White Act. The cost of the *Santa Clara* was \$3,500,000. Of this amount the Government contributed three-fourths, or \$2,625,000. But 82 per cent of the Government's share in the ship is \$2,152,500, which was redistributed throughout the country, helping the unemployment situation, 82 per cent going into wages.

Built in the port of Philadelphia by the New York Shipbuilding Co., its equipment was assembled from 32 States in the Union. Her entry into South American service is an important step in the furtherance of Pan American trade, according to officials of the Grace Line.

In a statement made by Daulton Mann, executive vice president of the Grace Line, before the big ship was warped out, the marine act of 1928 was praised as furthering the development of the American merchant marine and the *Santa Clara's* intended service was emphasized as bringing the United States and South America closer together and as fostering the further development of mutual understanding and sympathy.

Mr. Mann said in part:

The Grace Liner *Santa Clara* to-day started on its trial trip from the yards of the New York Shipbuilding Co. at Camden and will be the fastest passenger liner in service to the west coast of South America. With its maiden voyage from New York, April 19, a business man or tourist will be able to reach Peru in 9 days, and Valparaiso, Chile, in less than 16 days.

It means more than this. It means that the American merchant marine is on its way to renewed development and prestige through the assistance rendered American shipping by the merchant marine act of 1928, and the steamship *Santa Clara* is the first passenger liner in foreign trade built under this legislation.

The *Santa Clara* has been especially designed for the west coast of South America trade, flies the United States flag, and was built in one of the finest shipyards in the United States and powered with American machinery. With the *Santa*

Barbara and the *Santa Maria* she will make a trio of ocean liners of the latest kind, adding greatly to the prestige of the American merchant marine. The *Santa Clara* may be regarded as a natural product of the constantly growing trade and travel between the United States and the west coast of South America via the Panama Canal.

In size and arrangements, the *Santa Clara's* public rooms are similar to those of the *Santa Maria* and *Santa Barbara*, the chief difference being in the interior decoration, coloring, and furnishings.

The commodious staterooms of the *Santa Clara* have been especially designed for the ship's passage through tropical latitudes and cool west-coast South American weather and for the comfort and privacy of her passengers. As already stated, every room is an outside one, some having connecting sitting rooms. There are numerous private baths and suites de luxe and also a number of single rooms with shower baths and toilet.

The power plant of the *Santa Clara* consists of six oil-fired Babcock & Wilcox water-tube boilers, two 4,800-kilowatt General Electric steam turbine generators directly connected to two 6,300-horsepower synchronous induction motors driving the two propellers.

Practically all of the auxiliary equipment is electrically operated, involving approximately 950 horsepower in electric motors. These auxiliaries include devices for the safety, comfort, and convenience of passengers and crew, such as steering gear, capstans, electric cooking equipment, deck cargo-handling gear, boat-handling equipment and warping winches. Power for these auxiliaries is supplied by four 350-kilowatt, 240-volt turbine generators, the turbines being driven by steam from the same boilers used to supply steam for the main propulsion turbines.

Provision is made so that the ship can make long cruises at reduced speed, when only one main propulsion equipment will be needed to drive the two propulsion motors. At any time in regular service any one generating unit or propulsion motor may be shut down for repairs or other purposes, allowing the ship to proceed under power provided by the remaining equipment.

A refrigerating plant with motor-driven, brine circulating pumps supplies refrigeration to 9,000 cubic feet of cool air space and 6,000 cubic feet of frozen cargo space.

The *Santa Clara* is equipped with the latest devices for safety at sea, including the latest Sperry navigation devices, such as the well-known gyro-pilot bearing repeaters and automatic steering control of the 2-unit type. She also carries two highly efficient Sperry searchlights.

The act of 1928 is intended to protect United States commerce against exorbitant and discriminatory charges, to assure a market throughout the world for the products of our farms and factories, and to be prepared for the emergency of war among other nations. Under this act, the Government has the right, when it helps finance the construction of the ships, to use them as naval auxiliary craft in case of necessity.

It is well known that wherever an American ship goes, American trade expands. The advent of a magnificent ship like the *Santa Clara* to the South American trade under the famous Grace Line can not fail to be a big as it will be a new factor in commercial relations with the west coast of South America. In 1914 we had five ships under the American flag between the United States and South America. Our total South American imports and exports, then, were \$347,000,000. In 1927 there were 89 ships in this trade and it had expanded to over \$1,000,000,000 annually. In 1914 there was but a single line of American ships plying between the Pacific coast and the Orient and our trade was approximately \$386,000,000. In 1927, 145 American ships were engaged in the oriental trade, and imports and exports had risen to \$1,800,000,000, in which the expansion of American shipping facilities were a factor of great importance.

The value of the United States exportable surplus in 1926 was almost \$5,000,000,000. Our total bill for ocean freight was more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. American farmers saw ocean freight rates on wheat rise from approximately 8 cents a bushel in 1914 to 27 cents in 1915 and then soar to \$1.36 per bushel. By 1927 more than one-sixth of the total of American products were being sold abroad.

The American manufacturers and American farmers generally had come to view American shipping in a new light. The Shipping Board has disposed of vast numbers of old and obsolete ships built during the war. The cost to the Government of the operation of its merchant fleet has been reduced from more than \$40,000,000 annually to less than \$10,000,000. Government ships have rapidly been transferred to private ownership.

The fast and up-to-date *Santa Clara* is a result of the new policy for fast and up-to-date ships to meet the new standards of speed in ocean transportation and to be fitted with the most modern equipment throughout.

Few persons realize that it is now possible to make the journey from Europe to the west coast of South America via the United States than direct to the west coast from Europe. Mr. W. A. Young, passenger traffic manager of the Grace Line calls attention to the saving in time the *Santa Clara* will bring about in travel between Europe and west coast South American ports.

Europe to Peru via New York: From Europe to New York, 5 days; from New York to Peru, 9 days; total time from Europe to Peru, via New York, 14 days.

Europe to Peru by direct route: From Europe to Peru by direct route, via Panama Canal, 21 days.

Europe to Chile via New York: From Europe to New York, 5 days; from New York to Chile, 16 days; total time from Europe to Chile via New York, 21 days.

Europe to Chile by direct route: From Europe to Chile by direct route via Panama Canal, 26 to 29 days.

Direct route from Europe to Panama Canal, 17 to 20 days.

Route from Europe to Panama Canal, via New York, 10 days.

And so America is beginning to place her new ships upon the seas, and is starting off her first ship in the new move with a good-will tour. We have declared decentralized ownership of the American merchant marine as a national policy and are using our ocean mail bids as a means of furthering the merchant marine by giving in awards of ocean mail contracts to purchasers of Shipping Board lines. Further legislation is required.

Hon. WALLACE H. WHITE, chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee of the House of Representatives, said recently in an article in the New York Herald Tribune:

In the present session of Congress we shall take other needful steps to foster American shipping. Amendment of the ship construction loan law is needed to provide the lowest possible rate of interest while ships are being built. One of the most important changes of law needed to insure the upbuilding and maintenance of our merchant marine under private ownership involves reasonable assurance of the awarding of necessary mail contracts to companies which take over routes formerly operated by the Government.

Another urgent need is for legislation to curb unfair competition with regularly established American lines by foreign lines "skimming the cream" of ocean travel from our ports at certain seasons and leaving unprofitable business for our own vessels the remainder of the year.

The establishment and maintenance of an adequate merchant marine involves a struggle, but from it will flow benefits of importance not only to our own generation but to generations yet unborn.

In taking over the new ships the private American operators are confident of success. They would not run them expecting to lose money. And in their construction the Government is doing important work to reduce the present prevalent unemployment throughout the country and help the worker.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED GOOD-WILL TOUR

Mr. H. S. Wherett, president of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., says in part:

I think the plan, if it could be carried through on the basis of your present ideas, would be desirable and beneficial.

Mr. J. W. Doty, president of the Foundation Co., says:

I think the idea a good one. I have heard many industrialists state that they would like to make the trip to South America and I believe a canvass of the situation might probably decide for a fairly representative group.

Mr. F. Edson White, president of Armour & Co., states:

We believe, in general, that the United States manufacturers must be very watchful of the South American market and would heartily recommend this trip to those who are seeking this market.

Mr. F. J. Solon, director export division of the Owen-Illinois Glass Co., states:

We think the plan of an executive tour of this type is a very good one.

Mr. Leonor F. Loree, president of the Delaware & Hudson Railroad, and Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York says in part:

It seems that the object of the proposed tour is an excellent one.

Dr. L. S. Rowe, Director General of the Pan American Union, said in part:

I am certain that this tour will be productive of much good, not only in furthering closer commercial relations between the United States and countries of South America, but also in bringing about

a closer and better acquaintance between the manufacturers and exporters of this country and the merchants of South American countries.

A prominent New York banker very aptly said:

The American executive must discard his smug complacency and make a sincere gesture of appreciation to our South American neighbors if he expects to maintain their good will.

The following is a quotation from Isaac F. Marcossou, the celebrated author, writing on South America:

It is only when you land south of Panama that you realize how much misinformation about South America is lying around loose in our particular section of North America. * * * Accurate knowledge of that vast domain is almost as remote with a considerable body of us as were our products down there three decades ago. * * * So important is it to Europe that kings and princes have not hesitated to invade it in what is nothing more or less than the guise of commercial travelers. * * *

CONCLUSION—THE BENEFIT TO LABOR

Under the Jones-White Act the Government supplies three-fourths of the cost of these vessels as a loan, which means that every American citizen has a definite interest in these ships and should support this great national policy by riding and shipping on these boats.

As to the number of workers employed it would be very hard to give any round number estimate, but according to the National Council of American Shipbuilders, the labor which contributes to the finished ship is composed of almost every known craft. Taking a \$15,000,000 ship as a basis, the national council assumed that 78 per cent goes to American labor, involving a total labor cost of about \$11,700,000, or 2,340,000 days' work, or the employment of 7,800 workmen at \$5 per day for one year, or 2,600 workmen for three years, which would be approximately the time required to build such a vessel.

The remaining 20 per cent after labor in the shipyard and labor in the field, forest, mill, and mine, has been paid, goes for intrinsic value of the ore in the mines, lumber in the forests, products in the fields, and profits to the manufacturers of these raw materials.

Taking the *Santa Clara*, first passenger and freight liner under the act as an example, we find that a maximum of 1,000 men and a minimum of 500 were employed over a period of 15 months at an average wage rate of 54 cents an hour, with a 44-hour week as a basis.

Under the mail-contract provision of the merchant marine act of 1928, the Postmaster General has awarded as of March 25, 1930, 35 contracts for the carriage of mail to steamship lines operating between the United States and foreign countries.

As a result 32 new ships are to be built at a total cost of \$179,973,000; in addition, 12 ships are now under construction at a total cost of \$43,178,000, a grand total of 44 ships costing \$223,151,000. One other ship already listed as completed is not included in this estimate since the money for labor has already been expended.

In addition 27 vessels are to be substituted for those now in service either by construction of new vessels or by reconditioning of old vessels.

Eighty per cent of the cost of these new ships will be charged to labor, of which approximately 40 per cent will be spent in the shipyards, and the additional 40 per cent will be spent on labor engaged in the mines, mills, forests, and the fields.

This means, that in actual figures, \$178,520,800 goes to labor under this great national shipbuilding policy.

Of the 12 ships now under construction approximately 80 per cent goes to labor, namely, \$34,542,400.

Of the 32 to be built \$142,816,640 goes to labor. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one hour. I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, on February 21 and May 25, 1928, I addressed the House at length on the subject of fiscal relations between the United States and the District of Columbia. The House honored me by having my remarks at that time printed as House Document No. 330, Seventieth Congress, first session. My statement at that time appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the document is available to Members and others who desire it.

Again on January 23, 1929—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2122—I spoke in detail on the subject of fiscal relations, and discussed the Bureau of Efficiency report on the same matter—House Document No. 506, Seventieth Congress, second session. There has been no material change in the fiscal situation since those statements were made, and I see no reason for again tak-

ing the time of the House in a detailed discussion of that matter.

The regular annual appropriations under which the District of Columbia government is operating for the fiscal year 1930 total \$41,487,615. The amount recommended by the Budget for the fiscal year 1931 totals \$45,502,028. The committee recommends \$45,334,317, an increase of \$3,846,702 over the 1930 appropriations, and a decrease of \$165,711 under the Budget estimates for the next fiscal year. It is estimated that the total revenues for the District of Columbia for 1931 available for appropriation will be \$39,748,000. To this should be added an estimated surplus of \$7,180,000, making a total of \$46,928,000. From that should be deducted \$4,000,000, which must be held in reserve to enable the District to remain on a cash-paying basis. Therefore there is a net amount available for appropriation for the fiscal year 1931 of \$42,928,000. In this total is included the regular \$9,000,000 contribution of the United States to the District of Columbia. As is usual, those who complain about this contribution are comparing the \$9,000,000 lump sum to the total of the bill—\$45,334,317—and arriving at a percentage basis on those totals. To do so is obviously unfair.

Included in the total definite amount appropriated this year is \$1,945,277, which is taken from the reserve built up during past years, which amount is exclusive of an additional sum of about \$1,300,000 to cover indefinite items carried in the bill for the policemen and firemen's pension fund and for acquiring land under condemnation proceedings for the opening and extension of streets under the plan for the system of highways in the District. To that amount the United States has contributed, along with the District taxpayer, so that it should not now be considered in any comparison of contributions by the United States and the District. Also carried in the bill this year are appropriations of \$1,950,100 from the gas tax and \$1,690,940 from the water revenues. These items make a total of \$5,586,317, which should not be considered in any comparative statement of fiscal relations. The \$9,000,000 contributed by the United States should be compared with the total of \$30,748,000 which constitutes the revenues from real and personal property taxes, taxes on banks, and so forth, and miscellaneous revenues. On that basis the contribution of the United States amounts to 23 per cent of the total. However, under the language of the bill the United States releases to the District of Columbia certain miscellaneous revenues which it is estimated will amount to \$1,035,000 during the fiscal year 1931. Considering the amount contributed and the amount released the Federal contribution is slightly less than 25 per cent of the total.

There can also quite properly be added to the total contributed by the United States the cost of salaries of various Army officers assigned to duty with the District of Columbia totaling \$123,021, the services of various other officials and departments for which no charge is made, the use of Government buildings and property for which no rent is charged at a fair rental basis of \$112,000, surplus property transferred to the District without charge at a value of \$279,093.28 during the fiscal year 1929. This transfer during the last five years has totaled \$491,423, all of which leads inevitably to the conclusion that the United States is being decidedly fair and generous in its treatment of the District of Columbia.

The people of Washington speaking through their various organizations have been demanding the best of everything in city government and at the same time have insisted that they should pay only an average, or in many instances, a below-average tax rate. The two can not exist together. An increase of taxes must inevitably follow increased appropriations for betterments and running expenses. It would help greatly if, when resolutions are submitted to Congress for increased expenditures, that there should accompany the resolution a statement expressing a willingness to pay increased taxes to meet the desired obligation. Increases of salaries, buildings, improvements, all cost money. For every \$650,000 added to the cost of running the District government an increase of the tax rate of 5 cents per hundred is necessary.

The amount carried in this bill and other charges arising thereunder would, if paid out of current revenues, call for a tax rate of \$1.90. That increase will not be necessary this year, due to the use of the available surplus. With the enactment of this bill into law that surplus will be gone. However, if the proposed police and firemen salary increase bill is enacted into law this session of Congress, a tax rate for the fiscal year 1931 of at least \$1.80 will be necessary, if, as I believe should be done, the District's cash fund is fixed at \$4,000,000, instead of \$3,000,000, the present amount.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does the gentleman know what comment the District authorities made on the report of the Speaker of the House a few days ago as to prices fixed by the court and jury on the estimated value of property that the Government wishes to take for building purposes, showing in some instances the assessment of the property at less than 50 per cent of the value fixed by the jury? Has there been any suggestion by the officers that they will increase the assessment of the property?

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman has touched upon a matter that has given us all considerable concern, and that situation is the reason for carrying in the bill the proviso that in the purchase of school lands they can not pay more than 125 per cent of the assessed value of the property. I have heard nothing from the officials since the Speaker made the statement. I think the gentleman has noted what I did that the newspapers of Washington practically killed that story. Obviously they do not want the people to know that Congress is displeased with the robbery going on whenever the Government wants to purchase real estate. Some time ago a statement was made to me that buying options on land to sell either to the United States or the District of Columbia was a recognized business in Washington and that any attempt by Congress to limit the amount the Government could pay for land was an interference with legitimate business and the doing of something which Congress had no right to do. I think that is the attitude of many Washington real-estate men.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I think the provision you put in, limiting it to 125 per cent of the assessed value, is work in the right direction, but I doubt whether it will be entirely effectual.

Mr. SIMMONS. It has been effective in securing the purchase of lands for school and park purposes in most cases at fair prices.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Of course, we can not get rid of the real-estate sharks.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What is the custom as to the assessment of property—is it at the full value?

Mr. SIMMONS. The property is supposed to be assessed at the full value. The assessor, in whom I have complete confidence, and who is one of the most valuable men in the government of the District, says that the appraisal for assessment now is on an average between 90 per cent and the full value, and in the present slump the assessment will get nearer to 100 per cent than it has for two or three years past.

The District of Columbia must face the facts. If the standard set in this bill is to be followed next year, it will be necessary for the commissioners to fix a tax rate of \$1.90. Actually the District is at that rate now, but the tax bill will not reflect that rate until next year. Here, again, the passage of the police and firemen salary bill will bring the annual rate to about \$2 if the standards set in this bill are to be followed.

Those in Washington who are willing to pay a rate of \$2 or higher may ask for continued increases in expenditures. Those who do not desire that increase should cease to be a party to demands for increased and often unwarranted expenditures.

In using a surplus of \$3,200,000 to which the United States has contributed, and including the \$9,000,000 from the United States, the amount of this bill and other charges in 1931 can be carried on a tax rate of \$1.70 per hundred. Should the United States return to the policy of paying 40 per cent of the cost of the District government, it would be necessary to increase the Federal contribution from \$9,000,000 to over \$15,000,000. Based wholly on the 1931 Budget figures, and assuming 60-40 as the basis of appropriations, the tax rate for 1931 would be about \$1.40. That figure shows the unfairness of the abuse heaped upon Congress by certain District interests and likewise the injustice of their demands.

I do not propose to discuss at length the entire bill. The report covers its main features, and at the close of my remarks I shall ask that it be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. My colleague on the committee, Mr. HOLADAY, has given detailed study to the police department. He will discuss that department, and hence I will not go into those details.

The bill carries two additional dental clinics in the Health Department, one for the use of white and one for the use of the colored population of the city. The committee makes no recommendation as to where they shall be located, stipulating only that they shall be placed where they can best serve the people of the District.

The bill carries \$3,000,000 for additional land purchases in the municipal center and \$65,000 for the services of architects, and so forth. The committee feels that a complete study of the whole needs of the District government should be had, a

complete plan of the entire structure marked out, and its utilitarian as well as architectural details determined. In our opinion the city should employ for advisory work in this service an outstanding architect of broad experience in the planning of public buildings. If the \$65,000 herein appropriated is not sufficient for that purpose the committee will consider favorably the appropriation of additional funds. This structure must be adequately planned, and to that end the committee expect the wholehearted cooperation and effort of the District officials charged with doing that work.

Two major items in the bill should be discussed—the schools and the water department. On the 7th day of December, 1929—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 249, volume 1—I discussed in detail the school-building situation and the school-building program. This bill as it came to the Bureau of the Budget from the District officials asked for \$655,000 for senior high schools, \$1,100,000 for junior high schools, and \$580,000 for elementary schools. The Bureau of the Budget was not satisfied with the requests of the school officials and changed and added to the requests so that there was submitted to the committee, including supplemental estimates, requests of the Budget for \$655,000 for senior high schools, \$1,340,000 for junior high schools, and \$1,095,000 for elementary schools. The committee was in general accord with the Budget on school-building matters save in one particular. It feels that no further construction of auditorium-gymnasiums should be had in elementary schools until the need for classroom construction has been met, and accordingly the committee has left out of the bill appropriations for the combined assembly-gymnasiums in the elementary schools.

The committee next called upon the school officials to submit a statement of additional needed construction. At our request the Budget investigated and submitted additional estimates for construction. These are all recommended, except in the case of a building at Connecticut Avenue and Upton Street, where necessary condemnation of streets and the laying of water and sewer mains make impossible construction at this time. This item is dropped with the approval of District officials. The Budget Bureau should not be criticized for making this recommendation, but rather commended for their willingness to go the full length for the schools of Washington. The bill now carries 36 elementary classrooms in addition to those requested of the Budget Bureau by District officials. For elementary classrooms in elementary buildings the school officials asked for new construction to provide for 25 rooms; the Budget Bureau submitted requests for the construction of 45 rooms; the bill as submitted by this committee carries money for the construction of a total of 61 elementary classrooms.

In order to compare junior-high-school figures it is necessary to estimate one-half a room for each year where the construction covers two years. On that basis the school officials asked for the construction of 44 rooms; the Budget Bureau recommended the same amount. To that this committee added 22, so that the bill now carries money for the construction of 66 junior-high-school classrooms. It also carries \$240,000 more for junior-high schools and \$475,000 more for elementary schools than was requested by the school officials when they submitted their regular estimates to the commissioners and the Budget. A total of \$3,240,000 is recommended for buildings. Let these figures stand as the answer to those in the city, and in particular those school officials who constantly assert their own friendliness for the schools and as constantly criticize Congress and the Bureau of the Budget. A detailed list of the authorized construction will be found in the report.

Likewise the committee has increased the Budget request for money for school sites from \$300,700 to \$360,700, making a grand total in the bill for school buildings and grounds of \$3,600,700. The bill also provides an additional sum of \$79,793 for the purchase of school building and playground sites, this amount being made up of unexpended balances of appropriations of former years.

The committee was again presented with requests for extensive increases in the number and salaries of school-teachers. It has been the opinion of the committee that Washington's schools have been and now are oversupplied with teachers and that the apparent shortage of teachers in some branches is due to faulty administration and assignment rather than actual shortages in numbers of teachers available.

In order to make certain that we were not in error in this the committee secured from the office of education a statement showing the average number of pupils per teacher in all cities of 100,000 or more population as compared with Washington, and likewise the average annual cost of instruction per pupil in those same cities compared with Washington. I shall insert the table in my statement at this point.

Average number of pupils per teacher, number of teachers employed, and number necessary as compared with other cities, for the school year ending June 30, 1928

[Prepared by the Office of Education, Department of Interior]

Schools	Average number of pupils enrolled per teacher		Number of teachers employed in Washington, D. C.	Number of teachers necessary to be comparable to all cities in Group 1	Average annual cost of instruction per pupil in average daily attendance	
	In all cities of 100,000 population or more	In Washington, D. C.			In cities of 100,000 population or more	In Washington, D. C.
Kindergarten.....	57.9	31.8	198	105	\$59.60	\$108.20
Elementary.....	37.5	33.2	1,530	1,355	75.81	85.80
Junior high.....	29.4	23.6	301	258	98.02	112.25
High.....	26.5	23.8	506	454	137.85	139.98
Vocational.....	24.6	16.8	50	34	168.39	201.93
Normal.....	20.2	13.6	46	31	239.40	252.25

This statement shows that Washington has more teachers per pupil-load in every branch of the city schools than the average of the country in cities of more than 100,000. Washington has 394 teachers above the average of the country, or, stating it the other way, if Washington had teachers sufficient only to meet the average of the large cities of the country there could be a reduction of 394 from the total list. Accordingly the committee has approved the employment of new teachers only in those cases where new buildings are being opened and for the teachers' college. The greatest disparity in the average of the country and in Washington is in the kindergartens, the vocational, and the normal schools.

The average number of pupils in all cities of the United States per kindergarten teacher is 57.9, while it is 31.8 in Washington. The average annual cost in the United States per kindergarten pupil is \$59.60, while in Washington it is \$108.20.

Washington has been maintaining two teachers per kindergarten class. It is proposed to reduce that number to one, to reduce the classes from 3 hours to 2½ hours per day, and to have each teacher handle a maximum of not more than 55 pupils per teacher in the two groups. In view of the fact that the average of the country is one teacher per 57.9 pupils, the fixing of a maximum of one teacher for 55 pupils in Washington is not thought excessive.

It is also proposed to eliminate the subkindergarten classes of pupils of 3½ and 4 years of age. This arrangement will release 7 classrooms for other classes and create a surplus of 78 kindergarten teachers. It is the desire of this committee that those teachers be not discharged. Many of them are qualified to do grade teaching, and accordingly, the bill carries a provision authorizing their transfer into the teaching staff of grades 1 to 4. This will result in a saving of at least \$140,000 a year in salaries and will not injure the educational force or benefits. This plan has the approval of the school officials and all but two members of the board of education who were before us. It appears to be opposed only by those who fear that graduates of the normal schools this year may not be given positions at once. The District taxpayer has given the normal-school graduate a free education. There are those who seem to think that they are also entitled to demand and receive a job, whether their services are needed or not. I do not share that view. I see no obligation on the part of the taxpayer to give them both a free education and a lifetime job.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GLOVER. Has the gentleman figured out under the contribution of \$9,000,000 by the Federal Government what percentage that would be of the whole of the District taxes?

Mr. SIMMONS. I gave that a moment ago. With \$9,000,000, plus the amount of revenues released to the District, it amounts to just slightly under 25 per cent of the total.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. I noticed a comment this morning in the press concerning the opposition to this particular transfer of kindergarten teachers. Did the gentleman notice that?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and I shall discuss that now.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALL] asks that I discuss statements appearing in the press yesterday regarding this proposal. Those statements very obviously were made by peo-

ple who had not taken the time to either investigate the facts, to read the hearings on this bill, or to find out what the intention of the committee was. I have here a report signed by some of the officers of certain parent-teacher groups in Washington, in which this statement is made:

We understand that it is proposed to transfer before next year 78 teachers from the kindergarten groups to the grades.

Then they go ahead and base their statement upon that supposition. Inquiry over the telephone would have disclosed to these citizens who prepared this statement that their major premise was wrong. It was not proposed by the committee nor by the school officials who have discussed this matter with us that 78 teachers be transferred between now and next year. The proposal is that as vacancies occur in the teaching staff in the schools of grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 qualified kindergarten teachers be transferred into those positions, and the position not otherwise filled. I might read here also, because it has the same proposal involved in it, the statement that appears in to-day's Washington News, on page 5, under the heading "Labor Union Scores Kindergarten Cut," in which Mr. Coleman, secretary of the local labor union, is quoted as making the following statement:

We propose that the present highly trained kindergarten specialists be absorbed into the kindergarten department as vacancies occur therein; that as vacancies occur the burden of the present group be increased, and that these highly trained teachers be not suddenly put into another special field for which they have not been trained.

Mr. Coleman is obviously working under the same misapprehension of facts that prompted the parent-teachers' group to take the action they did.

In order that the House may have before it the record, I read from page 908 of the hearings the following upon this particular matter. On page 908, referring to a series of tables that were before us, I said:

This table shows very clearly that you are overtaught in the kindergarten.

To which Mr. Kramer replied:

There is no question about it. I do not think anybody denies that. The only question is whether you shall adopt a different system of kindergarten teaching.

Then, again, he said:

We are not overtaught with that character of system—

That is, two teachers for every schoolroom, but admittedly overtaught if they are to come to one teacher in the kindergarten per classroom. Mr. Haycock, assistant superintendent, on the same page stated that they had been trying to eliminate the kindergarten teachers as fast as possible. As to that, Mr. Haycock is obviously misinformed, because they have been employing kindergarten teachers as vacancies occur.

On page 910 of the hearings Doctor Ballou said:

I want to say we want to help the committee in every way we can in the solution of this problem, and my only reason for wanting to participate in this discussion at this moment is that we are confronted with a real problem and I think it would be exceedingly unfortunate to drop from our service experienced and well-qualified and efficient teachers by any elimination of a program. We have been working toward this not only in the matter of reducing the number of kindergarten teachers but also in a statement of policy which was presented here this morning for the record. That presents a real advance over a former program.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. While the gentleman is discussing the question of the school system, can he give this committee some idea in respect to the rumors going around the District that 91 per cent of the pupils in the schools he talks about has some physical ailment, that some of them have lung trouble, and that some are undernourished.

Mr. SIMMONS. May I be permitted first to answer the question of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALL] and then I shall be glad to mention that. Reading further from Doctor Ballou's testimony:

Compared with the grades, kindergarten teachers are far more numerous. I was glad to hear the chairman say to Mr. Kramer and Mr. Haycock to use 55 or 53 as the number for two teachers in this morning and afternoon program. I want to say very frankly it is my professional opinion that no kindergarten teacher can teach 40 children in the morning and then take 40 other or additional children and teach them adequately in the afternoon.

To that I answered:

That was not the proposal.

And then Doctor Ballou said:

I understand it was not; and that is why I say I am glad to hear you indicate that.

Again, Doctor Ballou said, quoting from the hearings:

We are very rapidly working toward that, much more so every year, except in this kindergarten situation. The average of 50 or 53 for the country is based on—

Mr. SIMMONS. It is 55 for the country.

Doctor BALLOU. Is based on a teacher carrying one group of children in the morning and one in the afternoon. That procedure which has been indicated in the record here contemplates working toward that program, because we now have regularly establish kindergartens in the afternoon.

Doctor Ballou states that there are now afternoon kindergarten classes, and so I call attention to the statement of the Parent-Teachers' Association, in which they intimate that there are no afternoon kindergarten classes in Washington.

Doctor Ballou says, on page 911 of the hearings:

The law provides that we shall appoint from these two lists. They have been appointed to the kindergarten. They are, I think, legally not eligible under the present law for appointment in the first grade or in any of the grades of the elementary school. If there could be legislation—and I suggest this for the consideration of the committee—which would say that a teacher of successful experience in the kindergarten is hereby made eligible to teach in the lower grades of the elementary school, you would remove the legal barrier and then we could transfer these kindergarten teachers to the first, second, or third grade and utilize them very promptly.

Now get this, because the charge has been made that we propose to put into the elementary schools untrained and incompetent teachers. As to that, Doctor Ballou says:

They are very efficient and superior teachers for the most part. I think they are as fine a group of teachers as there is in the city.

Then, on page 912, Doctor Ballou says:

I was suggesting that if this committee provided the legislative provision which you contemplate incorporating in the bill, which we are now discussing, and add this additional provision which I have just suggested, which in my judgment is entirely within the authority of Congress, it would adjust that particular situation, I think, as advantageously as it can be adjusted.

Then, again, Mr. HOLADAY said this:

Mr. HOLADAY. I should think, Doctor, that as a general rule these kindergarten teachers would make very excellent teachers.

Doctor BALLOU. They would make excellent first or second grade teachers; yes, sir. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Do you include all of them or just part of them?

Doctor BALLOU. I think most of them would. I would say this. We would consider the assignment to the first and second grades of those who could do it better than others might, who may be candidates for assignment. In other words, we can select the ones we think would be able to do the work.

Speaking further, Mr. HOLADAY said:

Mr. HOLADAY. From the standpoint of a layman, I think I would be willing to risk a teacher who was a success as a kindergarten teacher, in the first grade.

Doctor BALLOU. I have no doubt about it. I heartily indorse that as a proposition. I am only talking about the technical aspect of it, because I am personally sure, gentlemen, if we undertake to transfer a kindergarten teacher to a vacancy, No. 1 on the consolidated normal school list would mandamus us to prevent it and would succeed in the court. I have not any doubt about that on the basis of court decisions as to the rights of a person who stands No. 1 on the appropriate list.

Then, in order that the House may understand that the proposal of the committee never contemplated what the parent-teachers' group and Mr. Coleman assumed that it did, I call your attention to page 914 of the hearings, where I asked—

If you have what eventually would be a saving in salaries of \$140,000, this transfer of the kindergarten teachers, if made, would result in the availability of about \$140,000 in salaries in the other items. You are asking here for an increase of \$83,000 in salaries for this year.

Can you get the full benefit of the \$140,000 within a year?

Mr. KRAMER. I do not think so. That would be a mere surmise. I would not be optimistic enough to think we could get it in a year.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was my guess, but I wanted to put it up to you to see what your reaction was.

That is on page 915 of the hearings. Then, further on the statement is made that we did not contemplate the discharge of these teachers. We do not want them to be discharged. We do not propose to transfer into the elementary schools teachers

that are not qualified. Neither do we propose any radical change. The statement handed to me yesterday by the Parent-Teachers' Association winds up with this statement:

We believe that when we have put at the head of our school system trained educators who have spent years in the study of educational methods and educational progress, and are trying to keep our schools abreast of the best in the country, that we should have some respect for their judgment in matters of educational policy and that they do not deserve to be met with the lack of confidence and sarcastic criticism which is so apparent all through the hearings.

So I say to those who sent this memorial to me that they should have the same respect as we have for the judgment of the school officials in matters of educational policy, and that they should follow those educators as the committee proposes to follow them in matters of kindergarten policy.

Mr. CARTER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARTER of California. Are these kindergarten teachers who continue to do their work to be assigned to grade work?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARTER of California. Is it proposed to lessen the number of kindergarten teachers now employed?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is so proposed.

Mr. CARTER of California. Would other kindergarten teachers be employed?

Mr. SIMMONS. No, sir. At the present time there is a surplus of 78 kindergarten teachers. The kindergartens here cost \$108.20 per pupil per year, while the average cost throughout the country is \$59.60, so that there is an excess cost for kindergarten instruction in this city. The proposal is to transfer the surplus kindergarten teachers into grades 1, 2, 3, and 4, those who are qualified teachers, in order to lessen the number of teachers in the kindergarten schools and not to displace any of the teachers. In the Washington schools we have 394 teachers more than would be necessary if the Washington schools were only up to the average of other schools in large cities throughout the country.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska concur in this idea advanced that kindergarten teachers should not be asked to teach in the afternoon if they teach in the forenoon? What is there about the work, different from work in other departments, that a kindergarten teacher can not teach in both the forenoon and afternoon?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not approve of that idea. At the present time the system is to allow the teacher to teach three hours in the kindergarten school. Many of them have classes consisting of between 20 and 30 pupils. At the E. V. Brown School in Chevy Chase, with a total of 106 pupils, there are 4 teachers, all working in one room; 2 teachers in the morning and 2 teachers in the afternoon. The teachers teach for three hours and have two hours to do clerical work, testing work, and supplemental work, whatever they can put them at. This proposal provides that each teacher shall teach five hours per day.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I gathered from what the gentleman said that there was something about teaching in the kindergarten that made it inadvisable or improper to have a teacher conduct an afternoon class if she conducted a morning class in the kindergarten.

Mr. SIMMONS. No. I was pointing out the fact, if the gentleman will permit me to explain, that in this memorial that was circulated yesterday among some of the parent-teacher groups, the statement was made "as parents, we deplore the idea of afternoon kindergartens at all." I think the gentleman and I are in accord on that subject.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Do I understand the gentleman to say that it costs \$108 per pupil in Washington and an average of \$59 elsewhere?

Mr. SIMMONS. Elsewhere in cities of over 100,000 population.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Is that because the schools are overtaught or because the teachers are better paid in Washington than in other cities?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is largely because the schools are overtaught. In the report you will find a table showing the average in cities over 100,000 population and in the District of Columbia. I do not think the variance is in the salaries of teachers so much as the fact that there is an elaborately set-up staff on the basis of the number of teachers involved. The effort here is not to reduce the salaries. The effort is to keep everybody employed who is now employed, but to reduce the total allowed in the kindergartens.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. And to guarantee the child the best possible teaching?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the best answer I can give the gentleman is that my younger son, who is now sitting in the gallery, will enter kindergarten next year.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think it is important that the committee know something about conditions in the District of Columbia, since the gentleman is so well versed in the subject.

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman has raised a question about which I can probably give no definite information. I will say that I have no information to lead me to believe that the facts which the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has reported are true. I can not believe it from my own personal observation.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Has the District Committee made any investigation with respect to the health of the children in the District of Columbia, and with respect to other important conditions, as the result of which we may expect to bring up great American citizens?

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman will understand that the subcommittee of which I am chairman has to do with appropriations, and that the matter to which the gentleman refers would probably be properly referred to the District legislative committee.

I referred to the faulty administration and assignment of teachers as being responsible for an excessive teacher load and at the same time an apparent shortage of teachers. Tables submitted by the school officials show that out of a total of 2,742 teachers reported on, 458 of them are carried not as regular classroom instructors, but are supplementary, special, and miscellaneous. There are teachers who teach the teachers how to teach, teachers doing research and clerical work, teachers giving mental tests, and so forth, all of which adds greatly to the cost of education. Detailed tables of these assignments are available in the committee rooms for those who wish to study them.

There has been wanton extravagance in the expenditure of school funds. The rights of the taxpayer and the rights of the child in the schools have alike been ignored, while educational luxuries and needless accessories have been purchased for the use of a favored few and to please the vanity of those who serve in Washington schools.

This committee can not and should not be expected to supervise the expenditures for furniture and equipment. We must rely upon the expending and administrative officers to carry out those matters. The confidence we have had in the school board and school officials has been sorely taxed. Time at the hearings did not permit us to go into all of the expenditures and time here will not.

The largest item of expenditure carried heretofore was \$450,000 for furniture and equipment in the McKinley High School. The superintendent of schools promised the committee that as to quality the purchase of equipment for this school would be no better and no worse than that purchased for the Eastern High School, and similar to that provided in Eastern, Western, and Armstrong High Schools. That promise was not kept. Purchases were made for equipment and furniture at the McKinley and other schools that are both extravagant and unwarranted—expenditures that most certainly the school officials knew this committee would not approve.

The most elaborate and extravagant equipment has been requisitioned and purchased. The electrical equipment of the junior and senior high schools is similar to the show rooms of a city store: Laundries, bathrooms, kitchens, dining rooms, all the most expensive equipment; velvet rugs, tapestry upholstered furniture, chairs at \$115 each, sofas at \$130, gold-lined silverware, high-priced linens, dining-room chairs of mahogany with hair-cloth seats, bedrooms equipped down to such details as night stands and vanity dressers and boudoir lamps, candlesticks at \$9 a set, salt-and-pepper sets at \$17.50, meat platters for \$15.75, Victrola records of such standard classics as *We Won't Go Home Until Morning* used to add a strictly idealistic touch to the scene—and so the story of squandered funds might go on. Pianos, specifying Steinways, were bought for class rooms as well as for the auditorium, four grand pianos in one school building, on the highest bid—lower bids being rejected—and the public money squandered to meet the whim of a music teacher, and possibly likewise to meet the wishes of a piano salesman. Thirteen thousand five hundred dollars was paid for a pipe organ. The grand pianos and the pipe organ were purchased and installed in the McKinley High School while the students waited over a year for the equipment of a lunch room—and yet they claim that the best interest of the student body received first consideration.

Specifications were so drawn that only the desired article could meet the specifications and all other bids were rejected, even though the differences were not material in the various makes.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman also knows that the high schools are equipped with armories and rifles, concrete rifle ranges, and such military appendages, does he not?

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman has advised me of it and I do not doubt the truth of it. I would not be surprised to find anything in the schools after what we have already found.

The result is that the desires of heads of departments were met regardless of price, although not well justified. Prospective bidders, knowing that their article was favored and that the head of a department would likely be successful in defending his choice, seldom made a low bid, and other bidders likewise were easily discouraged and ceased to bid. Little or no control has been exercised by the school board or school officials over the individual whims and tastes of the various unit heads in the school system. Time after time suitable equipment that could have been purchased through the General Supply Committee has been rejected for higher-priced articles from favored dealers outside. Bids were repeatedly rejected because they did not cover the precise article specified. Purchase orders have been divided so as to evade the rule requiring competition in case of purchases in excess of \$25.

Gas ranges were purchased with the specifications so restricted that they required "gray enamel front legs," and the higher bid for ranges with gray enameled legs was accepted.

Articles of furniture such as cabinets that could have been made in the manual-training rooms have been purchased and put in those rooms.

Washing machines were purchased for the various schools, each school asking for and getting what it desired. Machines selected at a high bid for one school were rejected as very objectionable for another school, and then in turn specified and purchased for other schools. Low bids were rejected in one instance on the ground that the capacity of the machine was only six sheets, and yet it was a demonstration machine. In at least one instance the specifications called for a washing machine so equipped that the water could "be emptied electrically."

Among the things purchased for the gymnasium at McKinley are 9 climbing ropes at \$12 each, or a total of \$108; 3 horses at \$180 each, totaling \$540; 1 push ball at \$375—and so the story of extravagance might go on almost without limit. Electric dishwashers and laundry dryers were purchased. For seven dolls they paid \$82.25; for one doll they paid \$22.50—it was imported. Singer sewing machines were purchased repeatedly on highest bids and other bids rejected, although the evidence shows other makes were satisfactory. Two hundred and fifty-eight dollars and fifty cents was paid for an electric hem-stitching machine.

Equipment for the vocational schools, in particular in the print shop, described by experienced men in that line of work as useless and extravagant, was purchased over the protest of those who knew the practical side of those matters. Archery equipment to cost \$190 was asked for.

The purchasing officer of the District refused in many instances to buy, but was ordered to go ahead.

Apparently the school authorities either learned nothing as a result of the hearings or have determined not to recognize these criticisms, for since the hearings they have sent forward requisitions for such things as ironing boards at \$25 each, rejecting General Supply Committee boards at 63 cents each. An electric hat stretcher to cost \$25 has been ordered.

As a result of all of this showing, for which the school officials and school board are responsible, the committee feels that some one other than those heretofore in charge must have the right to veto the purchase of furniture and equipment, and accordingly the bill carries a proviso placing that power in the hands of the District Commissioners. We believe that we are justified in asking that the taxpayer be protected. It is obvious that the school authorities will neither protect the taxpayer nor make judicious use of funds intrusted to them for the benefit of Washington children.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. COLE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there was \$450,000 spent for equipment?

Mr. SIMMONS. In one high school.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman state what was the cost of the high school?

Mr. SIMMONS. As I remember it, somewhere between three and four million dollars. This is the McKinley Technical High School.

Mr. COLE. How many rooms are there in the school?

Mr. SIMMONS. The school has a capacity for 2,300 students. We are not objecting to the total cost. The committee approved the amounts. A technical high school requires considerable equipment—more than the ordinary high school—but I am objecting to the fact that after they promised us that the equipment would be of the quality basis of the other schools of the city, they made extravagant and unnecessary expenditures from the fund.

Mr. COLE. The reason I asked the question is because the total expenditures of course ought to bear some relation to the cost of the building.

Mr. SIMMONS. In that type of building—a technical high school—the total expenditure would be greater than in an ordinary high school.

Doctor Ballou submitted for the hearings a statement showing that out of 35,025 different items of material purchased, 24,884 were purchased through the General Supply Committee, 10,141 through bids secured by the purchasing officer of the District, and that all but 284 were awarded to the lowest bidder. There are two defects in his defense: First, the purchase of equipment in the luxury class might have been and probably was purchased from the lowest bidder; but the criticism as to that is that there should have been no purchase whatever. The second situation which Doctor Ballou's alleged defense does not cover is the drafting of specifications so as to exclude all but the desired article, so that under such circumstances, of course, they could show an acceptance of the low bid. The defense offered, while plausible on its face, will not bear examination.

Two years ago we indicated to school officials and the school board that we desired that school purchases and business matters be placed in the hands of a competent business executive. Nothing was done. Last year, in the bill, this committee inserted a salary for a business manager and indicated clearly what was intended as to his duties and responsibilities. After considerable blare of trumpets and publicity, the position was filled, and everything was done except giving the new business manager the duties and responsibilities that it was intended by Congress he should have.

The school board came before Congress this year with that position filled, but with the inefficient business situation unchanged. The new business manager admitted before us that he gave only a perfunctory supervision and approval to purchases, and that he had never been in the office of the purchasing officer of the District. This statement should not be construed as a criticism of Mr. Crane, the new business manager, for it appears clearly that he was never given the authority this committee desired he should have, and that the school officials and board had no intention of giving him that authority. These hearings were held during the week of February 10; the school officials expressed at that time their failure to understand the intention of Congress as to the business manager and indicated their intention of modifying the authority of the business manager to comply with the wishes of Congress. But they did nothing.

This bill was reported to the House on March 17, carrying the provision requiring the approval of the commissioners to purchase requisitions of equipment and furniture for the schools. Likewise, there has been a reduction recommended in the amount to be appropriated for school equipment. It is hoped that the school officials will understand the necessity of making reasonable and sensible purchases for the schools. On March 19, two days after this bill was reported, the Board of Education, according to the Washington Star, met and put Mr. Crane, the business manager, in "full, complete, and personal charge of supply purchases for the public schools." The statement then says that Doctor Ballou insisted during the hearings that Mr. Crane had been in charge since his employment, but Mr. Crane testified that he did not know what was being purchased, except in a general way, and never signed the requisitions. Mr. Kramer, assistant superintendent of schools, is then quoted as asserting that the action of the board on March 19 "merely makes a formal statement of what had been the understanding in school administration circles." A patently false statement, as the hearings disclose. The school officials, if they had that "understanding," very effectually denied it before the committee. It is clear that the action taken by the Board of Education on March 19 was not taken in accord with a policy that they

had expected to "effect gradually." The obvious attempt to mislead the people of Washington is resented by those who know the facts.

For a number of years there has been a demand in Washington for a change in the method of selection of the Board of Education. The present board—and, accordingly, the employees of the board from the superintendent down—are neither selected by the people of Washington nor by the administrative officials of the District government, and are not answerable for their stewardship either to the people or the District government. Either legislation should be had providing for the selection of a Board of Education by the people of Washington or the Board of Education should be abolished and the schools operated as a department of the city government, with the superintendent and other employees answerable to the city commissioners.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. COYLE. Does the Comptroller General pass in detail on the expenditures of the District government?

Mr. SIMMONS. All expenditures are passed upon by the Comptroller General after they are made; they are also passed upon by the auditor of the District.

Mr. COYLE. Is the auditor of the District a subordinate employee of the office of the Comptroller General?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; he is a District official.

Mr. COYLE. There might possibly be some element of safeguard if the Comptroller General had supervision in the District.

Mr. SIMMONS. The bill carries a proviso making it mandatory for the commissioners to approve purchases hereafter, which settles that one point.

Mr. CHALMERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHALMERS. I did not quite get the gentleman's last recommendation. Did the gentleman recommend that the school board be abolished?

Mr. SIMMONS. That either we have an elective school board in Washington or that the board be abolished and the schools operated as a department of the District government.

Mr. CHALMERS. If the gentleman will permit, it seems to me it would be unwise to give the District authorities or the city authorities veto power over educational appropriations. I do not like the idea of giving the commissioners that veto power. It seems to me the gentleman's criticism resolves itself into a matter of personnel. The business manager should have complete and ample authority to supervise all the purchases, and if he can not do it or will not do it you should get a new business manager.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield before he answers that question?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. It is the opinion of some of the members of the committee that the District Commissioners have that power now.

Mr. CHALMERS. I think there is danger there. I do not believe that educational appropriations should be supervised by the city authorities and I believe the educational authorities of the District should have the final say. I sympathize with the chairman in all he has said about curtailing extravagances, but I can not quite follow him on curtailing appropriations for the kindergarten department, and I do not believe that young kindergarten children ought to be in school in the afternoon, particularly in the late afternoon.

Mr. SIMMONS. They will not be in school in any event after 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Now, regarding the purchases. I admit that probably under ordinary circumstances in your city and in mine the school board and the school authorities should have complete control over the expenditure of school funds, but when you have a set-up such as you have in Washington, where the school board is not answerable or responsible to the people of Washington nor to the city administration, when the employees are answerable only to the school board and when you have a situation revealed such as our hearings this year disclosed, then I think some rather drastic steps must be taken.

Mr. CHALMERS. The chairman of this subcommittee and his colleagues can correct that and that should be done, on the showing the gentleman is making, but I believe it is an educational matter and should be kept in the Board of Education.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the gentleman think I am going to take the time or that any member of my subcommittee is going to take the time to go over all of these expenditures?

Mr. CHALMERS. You should change the personnel.

Mr. SIMMONS. We have no authority to change the personnel. The employees of the schools and the school board are responsible to nobody save the school board, and they in turn

are appointed by the judges of the Supreme Court of the District, who in turn hold office for life.

Mr. CHALMERS. Does the gentleman mean to say that the educational department of the District of Columbia is not finally in the control of Congress?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is not, unless Congress sees fit to change the present law.

Mr. CHALMERS. Then there should be a different set-up.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I am recommending, but at the present time the judges of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, who hold office for life, name the school board, the school board employs the superintendent, and other officials, and they are not answerable or responsible to anybody, and can not be removed by anybody except the school board. I am recommending that the legislative committee having to do with District matters study that, and that they provide for a Board of Education that is answerable to somebody in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CHALMERS. I agree with that; but I am in entire accord with the gentleman and his committee in their efforts to squeeze all of the extravagance out of the public-school management, particularly the supply department. I do not agree with the efforts of the committee to squeeze the kindergarten department. I do not think young children of kindergarten age, 4 and 5 years, should be kept in school in the afternoon. I am also in favor of reasonable assignments in each kindergarten room. The kindergarten director in each school ought to have a competent assistant who is a musician.

I also want to formally protest against giving municipal authorities the veto power over any part of the educational budget.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think the school board is answerable to the appointing power in Washington?

Mr. SIMMONS. The appointing power is the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Do they not have to give an accounting of their stewardship and their efficiency when they are up for reappointment at the expiration of their term?

Mr. SIMMONS. If that is what the term accountable means, then I presume that is true.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. I am putting this matter to the gentleman straight because I think it is one of the most vital questions affecting the District, and I am interested in the gentleman's thought that an elective school board may cure the evils which the gentleman has discovered.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am suggesting that as one of the possible remedies but not the only one.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Yet that is not necessary. In Philadelphia we have a school board which is appointed by the Board of Judges of Philadelphia County; they have the taxing power and are accountable to the judges for the proper discharge of their duties, and if a member of the school board does not give satisfaction he will not be reappointed when his term expires.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the satisfaction which the members of the school board here have to give is to the judges of the Supreme Court of the District and not satisfaction to the parents and taxpayers of Washington.

Mr. COYLE. Or to the Congress?

Mr. SIMMONS. Or to the Congress or to the District officials.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. SLOAN. Has not the Congress the right to change that at any time and deposit the power of control in other officials than the judges?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and I recommend here that that matter be studied by the legislative committee and something done about it.

Mr. SLOAN. It seems a very peculiar situation that the judges in their particular capacity should have the administration of school affairs.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. I will say that the Committee on the District of Columbia has that under consideration at the present time. There has been a suggestion that the board should be elected directly by the citizens of the District, and another suggestion is that possibly the appointment or recommendation should be placed directly in the hands of the President, so that the board will be more directly responsible to the Congress than at the present time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the situation justifies the committee on which the gentleman serves giving further serious study to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. PALMER. Does not the gentleman think the present policy or system is about as good as we could get? As I understand, the object is to keep the school board nonpolitical and entirely out of politics. At the present time we have the judiciary, we might say, making up the school board. Does the gentleman know of any better way to administer school affairs?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. PALMER. In order to keep them out of politics.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir. Let me answer the question. I will say to the gentleman that as an American I believe the American people have a right to run their own affairs.

Mr. PALMER. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. SIMMONS. And the people of Washington are competent to run their school affairs and to elect a school board.

Mr. PALMER. Does not the gentleman think it would get into politics just as soon as you gave the people authority to elect the school board?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think of politics in a derogatory sense. If politics is the science of government, then the science of government would mean putting the schools in politics.

Mr. PALMER. I think the schools should be kept out of politics, and that the board should be a nonpolitical one.

Mr. SIMMONS. At the present time the Board of Education and school officials recommend the expenditure of school funds, while the actual expenditure is made by District officials. Neither the school officials nor the city officials are responsible for the entire transaction. The whole set-up is wrong and leads to "buck passing" between the two organizations, and extravagance, inefficiency, and lack of responsibility follows. The whole matter should be studied by the District legislative committee, and comprehensive legislation had; in the meantime it is thought that the limitation proposed in this bill will prevent, in a large measure, a recurrence of the situation which I have described.

Three years ago the newspapers and civic organizations of Washington were protesting the cost of school buildings, claiming that they were being built on a much more elaborate scale than was necessary, and that therefore the Federal Government should pay a much greater part of the cost. The charges three years ago were unfounded. School buildings being built at that time were being built along utilitarian lines, permanently built, and economically built, and at the same time attractively built. We have been appropriating moneys for the building of additional buildings, stipulating that they should be built in accordance with the plans of approved buildings already constructed. Here again the expending officials in the District government have not kept faith.

The buildings now being built are constructed on a cost basis far more elaborate, ornate, and luxurious than any heretofore being built. Instead of attempting to build permanent buildings adequately equipped to meet all reasonable educational needs in an effort to provide modern buildings for the largest number of pupils, the present effort seems to be to spend the largest amount possible per unit of school accommodations being built. The most expensive patented appliances, equipment, and materials are being used. The architect offers as an excuse the statement that he is building buildings that will be in use 75 years from now. Personally, I am more concerned with furnishing the child of to-day permanent and adequate accommodations than I am in building a monument to an architect, so that four decades hence some one may marvel at what he produced. When there is not money enough to do both we should serve the child who is here now.

Strange as it may seem, the same newspaper that three years ago criticized Congress for building too elaborately and too extravagantly now criticizes Congress for attempting to curb extravagances and luxuries in school buildings. It would seem that their prime editorial motive is to criticize and oppose anything that Congress favors.

During the hearings I used the expression "doo-dad" in reference to the school buildings. Learned editorial writers have found themselves unable to interpret its meaning.

After some search the Library of Congress has delivered to me a definition of "doo-dad," and here it is. I am quoting now from page 352 of the publication called American Speech,

in its issue for May, 1927, where I find this, under the head of "Dialect Words from West Virginia":

Doo-dad is a noun and means any article for which the name is unknown.

[Laughter and applause.]

Sufficient now to say that as I used it it means extravagant ornaments, embellishments, and useless equipment and luxuries built into school buildings in order to satisfy the vanities of an architect and the comfort of a public official without consideration of the cost to the taxpayer or the rights of the school children.

We did not reduce the appropriations for school buildings, rather hoping that the architect and those laboring with him will work along the lines of economical expenditure hereafter, to the end that modern schools may be furnished a greater number of children from the funds expended.

The charge is again being made that the United States gets free water at the expense of the water users of the District. The constant repetition of a false statement does not make the statement true, and the charge of free water against the Federal Government, no matter how often made, will not make the statement true. It may, however, mislead some people into believing that it is true, and that is the obvious purpose of the statement.

The water system is now, and has been since 1917, a self-supporting activity. It is free from debt. Originally the entire system was built and paid for by the United States, and District consumers were allowed to tap the United States mains and take water free of charge. Gradually this system has been changed. At the present time the War Department controls the main system from Great Falls to the distribution reservoirs. The distributing system is under the control of the Water Department of the District of Columbia. No charge is made to either the District of Columbia or the United States for water used—hence the charge of free water. Such a charge can only be based upon the premise that the District of Columbia owns the entire water system. Such is not the case. What are the facts?

On page 731 of the hearings on this bill will be found a financial statement as of June 30, 1929, of the water-supply system. This statement shows that there is a capital investment in the water system of \$34,472,247.76. Of that amount the United States has paid \$10,931,923.97, the District of Columbia \$9,082,346.53, and there has been paid from the revenues of the water department \$14,457,977.26, which represents earnings on the United States and District investment. The United States has contributed either on the basis of 60-40 or 50-50 to the fund from which the District's \$9,082,346.53 was taken. But let us for the purpose of this statement credit the entire amount to the District. So that on the basis of moneys actually invested, exclusive of earnings invested, the United States owns 54 per cent of the water system and the District 46 per cent of the system. Or if earnings are to be considered, then 31.7 per cent has been paid by the United States, 26.3 per cent by the District, and 42 per cent from earnings of the department.

There has been paid out by the United States for maintenance \$1,473,871.92, by the District of Columbia \$932,086.61, and from earnings of the department \$14,925,767.97. There has been expended for construction and maintenance by the United States \$12,405,795.89, by the District of Columbia \$10,014,433.14, and from earnings \$29,383,745.23, or a grand total of \$51,803,974.26.

On the basis of amounts paid into the system for both construction and maintenance, and excluding payments from the water revenues, the United States owns 55 per cent of the water system and the District of Columbia owns 45 per cent. Or, including the earnings, the United States has contributed 24 per cent of the total, the District 19.3 per cent of the total, and 56.7 per cent represents earnings.

In this financial statement the return to the United States, on the basis of water used, is 2.22 per cent on its investment in the system for both construction and maintenance, and on the same basis the return to the District is 6.3 per cent. The leakage of the entire system, except for 30,000,000 gallons from Federal mains, is also charged to the District government's consumption in determining these percentages of return on investment. It is thought, however, that a more equitable distribution of the leakage would be to distribute it in the ratio of the Federal, municipal, and District users' consumptions to the total consumption—it is all one system and the same distributing mains supply all three classes of users. This would apportion 17.67 per cent of the leakage to the United States, 8.92 per cent to the District government, and 73.41 per cent to the District water users. The total consumption is 19,140,907,000 gallons a year. The total leakage in the system amounts to 8,223,143,000 gallons a year, or approximately 22,500,000 gallons

daily. The bill this year carries an item of \$40,000 for starting a survey of water waste in the distributing system and for reduction of this underground leakage. The statistics supporting this water-survey project are shown on pages 729 and 730 of the hearings. They show an estimated saving of 10,000,000 gallons of water a day, with a value of \$29,169 a year, is to be accomplished by a total appropriation of \$130,000 over a 4-year period.

As previously stated, the financial statement also uses as a basis upon which earnings are to be figured, the amounts put into the system by the United States and the District of Columbia for both construction and maintenance. The percentages of return on investment are figured on a basis of both construction and operation cost payments. Properly the \$34,472,247.76, representing construction costs only, is the capital investment in the system.

Of this investment 54 per cent represents investment and invested earnings thereon of the United States and 46 per cent investment and invested earnings of the District government. On that basis the United States has \$18,615,013.79 invested in the water system and the District government has \$15,857,233.97. Then on that basis of water consumed and with the leakage in the system equitably distributed the United States is receiving a return of 2.08 per cent on its investment, the District a return of 1.23 per cent, and the combined return is 1.69 per cent.

The water department is now operating on a self-sustaining basis. The cost of betterments and maintenance for a number of years has been paid from earnings. No one can properly quarrel with the economic soundness of that plan—yet there are those in Washington who do oppose it and claim that all expenses for betterments should be paid out of general revenues. The reason for their opposition is easily understood. They are the same group in Washington who demand that the United States contribute on a percentage basis to the cost of running the District government. If water department betterments are paid out of general revenues and if the United States should again contribute on a percentage basis, then the United States would contribute to the cost of those betterments; and even if we do not contribute on a percentage basis they desire the general revenue appropriation to be greater and the water department less than now as a basis for a demand for a larger lump-sum appropriation. So their concern is not with water rates, but rather with fiscal relations.

As an indication of the unfairness of those who attempt to get more for less from the United States, note the headlines in the Evening Star for March 20, 1930, "Huge drain on District of Columbia water seen in House Office plan; local users would pay for 1,330,000 gallons a day to ventilate new building."

The obvious intent of the article is to make the District water user feel that he is being robbed by the United States and to stir up opposition to the water-rate increase which this bill provides, for the article repeats the shelf-worn statement that—

In order to improve a water plant already furnishing free water to the United States Government, local water taxes are to be increased 37.6 per cent.

What are the facts? Instead of the contemplated ventilating system using 1,350,000 gallons a day as the article states, the system contemplated will use only 118 gallons a day. The sale value of this 118 gallons of water per day amounts to the stupendous sum of \$3.45 a year.

On March 21, in an editorial entitled "Free Water for Uncle Sam," the Star said:

Yesterday's Star disclosed that plans for the new House Office Building suggest tapping the District's water system to use 1,300,000 gallons of water a day to ventilate and cool the building. In addition to the fact that this use of water would overtax mains and reduce the water supply to private consumers in the area affected, the water would be paid for wholly by real-estate owners and taxpayers in the District. Good old United States would cool the feverish brows and calm the heated minds of Members of its House of Representatives at the expense of the unrepresented taxpayers of this community. The end, desirable as it may be, does not justify the means.

In view of the fact that the total consumption for the ventilating and cooling system is estimated at 118 gallons a day and not 1,300,000 gallons a day as stated in the Star, a grave doubt is raised as to whose "feverish brow" really needs cooling. [Laughter and Applause.]

As a matter of information the total consumption of water for the new House Office Building is estimated at 100,000 gallons a day. At the present time the consumption of water in the Capitol, the Library of Congress, and the House and Senate Office Buildings totals 665,000 gallons a day.

The Evening Star in their issue of March 24 carry a news item correcting, in large part, their erroneous statements of

fact about the use of water in the new House Office Building. However, they make no effort to correct the prejudicial and misleading statements of their headline and editorial writers.

On March 20, 1930, the Evening Star said that "local water taxes are to be increased 37.6 per cent." On March 21 the same publication states the average increase to be 26 per cent.

The Star also quotes Captain Oram as authority for the statement that Washington has "an equity" of \$23,540,000 in the water system. Why do they not tell the whole truth to the people of Washington? Washington has invested from its general fund in the water system \$9,082,346.53. This sum is taken from the general fund, to which the United States has contributed both on the 50-50 and 60-40 plan, so it does not even represent a payment of that amount by the taxpayers of Washington. The United States has invested out of the Federal Treasury and exclusive of contributions to the District treasury general fund \$10,931,923.97. From the earnings of the water system there has been invested in the water system \$14,457,977.26. Now, then, to get "an equity" of \$23,540,000 for Washington, the Star takes credit to the city for not only the capital invested from the District general fund, which I consider is proper, but also the Star claims credit to the District for the entire earnings of the water department, when the District owns but 46 per cent of the plant. If you should give credit to the United States for the entire investment, including contribution to the District general fund, then the United States owns 72 per cent of the water system and the District 28 per cent. But the Evening Star deems it perfectly proper to claim the entire earnings for the District.

Again, the Star says that "Washington has paid for its water system," and that there is "no bonded indebtedness on the plant," and, accordingly, water rates are lower here than in other cities.

If the United States were willing to contribute 54 per cent of the total cost of the water system of other American cities and likewise contribute quite liberally to the general revenue of those same cities as it does here, it is probable that other American cities could boast of having no debt and low water rates. But the United States does not so contribute, and, accordingly, other cities can not boast as Washington does about no debts and low rates. I rather imagine that many American cities would gladly accept the aid from the United States that has been accorded Washington. If that aid were granted I doubt if there is another American city that would complain about the United States receiving a reasonable supply of water from a system so jointly owned. All in all, it occurs to me that the Evening Star's presentation of the water situation could well be called the 1930 edition of the comedy of errors.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman understands that when the water system was originally constructed it was constructed entirely at the expense of the United States Government?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. Then, afterwards and for a long number of years the District paid one-half of the cost of operating the water department, including improvements, and the United States paid the other one-half, and all the revenues which, in amount, were about the same as the cost of operations, went into the Treasury of the United States Government to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Later the District of Columbia paid 60 per cent of the cost of operating the water department, including improvements, and the Government of the United States 40 per cent, and still all revenues of the water department went into the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia. The total cost of operating the water department, including improvements, and the revenues have been about the same. The District has been given all the revenues and the United States has paid half of the cost of operations and improvements. This means that the United States has paid all the costs of constructing the water system and all the improvements that have been added year after year; this merely means that the United States has borne more than 100 per cent of the cost of the building of the water department of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SIMMONS. On that theory of figuring, I take it the gentleman is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am wondering where this is all going to lead. I see that the District of Columbia, particularly the papers here, seem to have it in for Congress. What is the trouble with us up here? What are they always pecking at us about? [Laughter.] I understand the gentleman from Nebraska

is standing up and defending the Congress, but I am just wondering if we will ever be able to get along with the District.

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman knows that the reason for the criticism of Congress in Washington is the fact that there are Members of Congress who have some respect for the Treasury of the United States and are unwilling to have it turned over bodily to the people of the District of Columbia. In my judgment, if we paid the entire cost of running the District government out of the Federal Treasury, there are those in Washington who would complain that we were not doing it on a grand enough scale, and there are others who claim that under the Constitution we have no right to tax the people of the District.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I want to say to the gentleman that I went to a social function here the other day and met a very distinguished lady. She found out that certain Members of Congress were there, and she said she thought Congress ought to be abolished because it was always picking on the District of Columbia. [Laughter.] I am just wondering if the gentleman is going to keep us from being abolished. I want to commend the gentleman for at least defending us. They seem to have it in for us for some reason, and I do not understand it. I merely make this observation for whatever in may be worth. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SIMMONS. The appropriations carried in this bill this year for the water department total \$1,690,940. Of this amount \$963,940 is for maintenance and \$727,000 for betterments. On the basis of anticipated revenues at present rates there will be a deficit of \$142,000 in the water department during the fiscal year 1931. Either water rates must be increased or this deficit met out of general revenues. The District Commissioners have recommended the increases carried in the bill. It is anticipated that the proposed rates will bring increased revenues of about \$453,000 per year and will enable the District to carry on a 5-year program of betterments.

On page 747 of the hearings is a table comparing water charges in 27 American cities with the rates in Washington, and showing that the average charge for domestic consumption in the 27 cities is 67 per cent over the charges in the District of Columbia. The increase proposed in this bill when effective will still leave the average of the 27 cities 24 per cent higher than the Washington rate for domestic consumption—see table on page 749 of the hearings.

There can be no claim that the proposed rates are excessive or unjust. A comparative statement of the new and proposed rates appears on page 25 of the committee report on the bill.

The proposed rate increases will allow the proper expansion of the water system without charging the cost to the general fund, without the expedient of the issuance of bonds and the increase in costs that would result. It is a pay-as-you-go policy that will allow the District of Columbia to continue to have a water system without debt and with a low-rate rate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting the committee's report on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Before the gentleman yields the floor, may I ask a question?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman has been speaking of the various items as he has gone along, and, as the gentleman knows, I have been considerably interested in a connection between Rock Creek Park and Potomac Park, known as the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, I believe, referred to at the bottom of page 89. I find by a comparison with previous years there has been a slight increase in the appropriation for this work, and from reading the report of the hearings and the testimony of Colonel Grant I infer that the item carried now of \$134,755 is to complete the grading south from Massachusetts Avenue to the so-called sea wall which is to be built. I want to ask the gentleman to tell us the attitude either of the department or the National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the expected time of completion of this very important connection so that the roadway will be usable for its entire length between the two parks.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not have the figures before me, but the appropriation this year calls for the completion of the sea wall. This will be completed under the item carried this year. Then the item this year carries sufficient money to grade, as I understand it, one roadway on either side of Rock Creek Park down to the Florida Avenue connection. I would assume, although there is no understanding about this, that next year money will be carried in the bill to put in the paving. Ordinarily, between grading and paving one year elapses in order to let the road settle, and in particular is this necessary here in view of the fact that there are a large number of cuts and fills to be made.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, if the usual program is carried out, the next year's appropriation for this item would probably be intended to be sufficient to cover the surfacing of the road from Massachusetts Avenue to the sea wall so that the road would then be usable.

Mr. SIMMONS. I assume so, although I would not want to state that definitely.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am not trying to bind the gentleman, of course, but I wanted to get the view of the chairman of the committee as to the action that would probably be taken next year.

Mr. SIMMONS. It would be a waste of money to grade without immediately following that up with paving after the fill has settled, and I assume that will be done in this instance.

Mr. TREADWAY. I thank the gentleman for the information he has given the committee.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Has the gentleman in his remarks given to the House the benefits that the District is receiving from the enormous building program we are carrying on? Has the gentleman elucidated the benefit the District is getting in comparison with the rest of the country?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is a matter the gentleman can arrive at as well as I can.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes; but this constant criticism of Congress is based on misstatements. I think the gentleman is to be commended for his stand in defending the Congress. But the point I have in mind is the comparison between the District of Columbia and the balance of the country in the enormous building program that is being carried on. Practically half of this enormous sum is being expended in the District of Columbia, and naturally the inhabitants get the benefit of that situation.

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman may remember an editorial in one of the Washington papers criticizing Congress in making the public-building authorization for the District of Columbia, saying that it was too small, and in the same paper there was a statement that the authorization for public buildings throughout the country was "pork barrel." There is no way of satisfying them.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We have purchased the triangle down here south of Pennsylvania Avenue for public buildings, we have purchased the old Congress Hall Hotel property for our office building, and we have purchased the land where the Supreme Court building is to be erected. That takes from the District a vast amount of taxable property for revenue. Does the gentleman propose to make any provision for reimbursement to the District for the loss of that decrease of revenue?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the gentleman will take the hearings of last year on this bill and read the testimony of Assessor Richards, I think he will find an answer to that argument perfectly logical and fair.

In the first place, the amount represented in the purchase by the United States of this property can be divided, as Mr. Richards says, into three parts: First, one-third the land value; second, one-third the improvements thereon; and the third one-third is the pure, unjustified excess cost to the United States above actual value.

Now, the land value itself is increased in value. These buildings that are bought by the Government and torn down and are immediately replaced in a higher value in other parts of the city. Take the Southern Railroad Building that was bought by the United States. They went to Fifteenth and K Streets on a new site and erected a new building, and the District is receiving more money from taxation than it received prior to the time the United States bought the building. Mr. Richards said that the District is gaining in tax revenue, because the old buildings of low value are being replaced by new buildings elsewhere in the city of a higher value, and likewise the land north of Pennsylvania Avenue is increasing in value and tax returns, so the District is gaining and not losing as a result of these transactions. That is the opinion of the assessor.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McSWAIN. And property not abutting these new public buildings but in the vicinity of the real estate are enhanced in the commercial value, and if the tax assessors do their duty the result will be an increase of taxes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; the assessor went extensively into that during the hearings last year.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. I listened with great interest to the gentleman's speech and thought that when he came to the end there

would be a decrease in the appropriations, but to my surprise I found when I read the total that instead of decreasing the appropriation they are increased about \$3,000,000, or about 7½ per cent. Does that indicate any unfriendliness of the committee toward the District?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think that the record will show that Congress and the Bureau of the Budget has been very friendly to the District. Of course, \$3,000,000 in this bill is money carried for the purchase of the municipal-center property.

The two items that I discussed at length are very greatly increased in amount, and, in particular, the school facilities that we provide in this bill are far beyond what the school officials asked for when they went before the Budget last year, and are more than the Budget recommended to the Congress.

Mr. KETCHAM. The reason I asked this question is because I was afraid that those who have been sitting around this afternoon might infer that not only the gentleman and his committee but the whole Congress of the United States are extremely unfriendly to the District of Columbia, and I thought it worth a moment's time to call attention to the fact that notwithstanding all that has been said, when it comes right down to the real thing, we have appropriated \$3,000,000 more than we did last year.

Mr. SIMMONS. This is the largest and probably the most liberal bill that I have had to do with in five years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting therein the report of the committee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931:

SCOPE OF THE BILL

The bill embraces all regular annual appropriations chargeable partly to the Treasury of the United States and partly to the revenues of the District of Columbia, including appropriations on account of park areas under the jurisdiction of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Zoological Park, and for certain work being performed under the supervision of the Engineer Department of the Army.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES

The estimates of appropriations upon which this bill is based were submitted by the President in the Budget for the fiscal year 1931 and will be found in detail in that document under chapter 13, pages 1355 to 1479, inclusive, and in supplemental estimates submitted in House Document No. 310. There follows a summary of the regular annual appropriations for 1930, the Budget estimates for 1931, including the supplemental estimates, and the amounts proposed in the bill for 1931, separated in several funds so as to indicate in a general way the sources of revenue from which the appropriations will be met. The totals of the permanent annual and indefinite appropriations (amounts which it is not necessary to carry in the annual appropriation bill) are also shown at the foot of the table and included in with the grand total so as to indicate the final figures affecting the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia.

Appropriations and estimates, District of Columbia

Source of revenue	Appropriation, 1930	Estimates, 1931	Amount in bill	Increase (+) or decrease (-); bill compared with 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (-); bill compared with estimates
Payable from gasoline-tax fund.....	\$1,658,500	\$1,905,000	\$1,950,100	+\$291,600	+\$45,100
Payable from water revenues.....	1,495,330	1,647,800	1,690,940	+195,610	+43,080
Payable from District revenues, derived from taxes on real estate, tangible and intangible personal property, public utilities, banks, etc., and from miscellaneous sources.....	29,333,785	32,949,168	32,693,277	+3,359,492	-255,000
Payable from U. S. Treasury.....	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-----	-----
Total regular annual.....	41,487,615	45,502,028	45,334,317	+3,846,702	-165,711
Permanent and indefinite appropriations.....	3,052,500	2,482,500	2,482,500	-570,000	-----

The regular annual appropriations under which the District of Columbia government is operating for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, total \$41,487,615. The amount recommended for the fiscal year 1931 as contained in the President's Budget (and including the supplemental estimates amounting to \$684,300) total \$45,502,028. The amount that has been recommended by the committee in the accompanying bill is \$45,334,317, an increase of \$3,846,702 over the 1930 appropriations, and a decrease of \$165,711 under the total Budget estimates submitted for the next fiscal year. The following table will show the distribution of these figures between the various divisions and services of the municipal government. An explanation of the committee's action in each instance appears under the appropriate heading in this report and an itemized tabulation of the figures at the end.

TAX RATE AND FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

The committee has recommended the usual Federal contribution of \$9,000,000, which amount has been carried for the past several years. Provision has been made in the bill that the present tax rate on real estate and tangible personal property shall not be reduced during the next fiscal year.

COMMISSIONERS

As in the instance of the other appropriation bills where the Committee on Appropriations has excepted the assistant heads of the executive departments from the "average provision" with reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended, contained in all appropriation bills, which precludes the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit from exceeding the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, the committee has excepted the two civil commissioners likewise. The average salary rate of grade 15, senior executive officer, is \$8,500. Excepting this grade from the provision mentioned above new civil commissioners appointed could go to the top of the grade, \$9,000, after appointment.

SALARY INCREASES

When the estimates were presented to the committee, automatic increases to the extent of \$245,573 for teachers, policemen, and firemen were contained in the total, and increases to employees under the classification act of 1923, as amended, amounting to \$100,683. The committee's recommendations contain the amounts necessary for the automatic increases, but, with several exceptions where employees were at the minimum of their respective grade, salary increases in the neighborhood of \$100,000 have not been recommended. This committee in reporting the District appropriation bill in 1929, included an amount of \$163,041 for salary increases, and last year (1930) an amount of \$572,000, due to the Welch Act increases, was included in the bill, making a total altogether for the past two years of \$735,000. On the basis of this large amount, which has been devoted exclusively to salary increases in that period, the committee refused to recommend an additional \$100,000 for the next year. This, of course, does not mean that no salary increase can be made during that time, because money in appropriations is usually available due to resignations, lapses in salaries, turnover, etc., and where an especial case is presented, it can be taken care of. After making a comparison with the employees in the executive departments, the committee was of the opinion that the municipal employees of the District of Columbia stood on a very favorable basis.

BUILDING INSPECTION DIVISION

The estimates presented to the committee for the building inspection division were based upon the addition of 18 new positions, at a total salary obligation of \$42,640. These embraced one first deputy inspector of buildings at \$4,600; 1 zoning engineer in the engineers' section at \$3,200; 1 chief concrete and steel inspector and 1 senior inspector of concrete at \$3,200 and \$2,600, respectively, in the engineer inspectors' section; an assistant chief elevator inspector at \$2,800; and 2 field inspectors at \$2,000 each in the elevator inspectors' section; 1 inspector at \$2,000 in the fire-escape section; 5 inspectors at \$2,300 each in the general inspectors' section; and 1 clerk and 1 messenger. The committee has recommended all of these positions with the exception of the deputy inspector of buildings and the messenger, both of which it was felt were unnecessary. Salary increases to the extent of \$2,000 also were not recommended.

PLUMBING INSPECTION DIVISION

Under the figures in the bill for the plumbing inspection division there is recommended \$43,100, which figures differ from the present year by including the recommendation of an assistant plumbing inspector at \$2,600 needed to inspect the installation of automatic refrigerators, which have been increasing in large numbers under new construction. Under new regulations which it is contemplated to be adopted by the District Commissioners, the necessary requirements for the position must be possessed by a man who has had wide experience in automatic refrigeration and factory experience.

ASSESSOR'S OFFICE

There is recommended for the office of the district assessor \$223,070 for next year, an increase of \$15,560 over this year. In the amount proposed in the bill salary increases for the eight assistant assessors

from \$4,600 to \$4,800 have been approved. An amount of \$1,100 also has been included with the recommendations to bring the salary of the assessor from \$6,400, the amount which he now receives, up to \$7,500, or from the maximum of grade 13 up to the maximum of grade 14, in the event that this position is reallocated. New positions provided for in the estimates and approved by the committee provide for one deputy assessor and four additional clerks and the transfer of two positions heretofore on the per diem roll of the engineer's department to the assessor's roll. The salary proposed for the deputy assessor in the estimates was \$4,600. Being a new position, it has not as yet been allocated; so the committee, recognizing the necessity of having a first assistant to the assessor, has included \$1,000 in the bill, with the expectation of this position instead of being allocated at the minimum of grade 12, \$4,600, that it be allocated to the minimum of grade 13, \$5,600, and that the assessor be allocated up to the maximum of grade 14, \$7,500, which respective grades are consistent with the importance of the duties coming under these two positions.

LICENSE BUREAU

For personal services, the bill carries the same amount as for the present year, a small item covering \$120 for a salary increase having been eliminated.

An estimate for \$20,000 for the purchase of motor-vehicle identification tags has been recommended. This is to cover the cost of approximately 170,000 pairs of automobile identification tags at 12 cents a pair. These tags will be manufactured, as they have been for several years past, at the District of Columbia Reformatory at Lorton, Va., by the inmates of that institution as one of the industrial activities conducted there. In the fiscal year 1930 the cost of manufacturing these tags was paid for out of the appropriation for maintenance of the reformatory, an item having been included in that appropriation for that purpose. For the fiscal year 1931 the above appropriation of \$20,000 is included in order that the superintendent of licenses may make transfer to the working capital fund to cover the cost of manufacturing these tags.

AUDITOR'S OFFICE

An appropriation of \$126,200 is suggested next year for the office of the District auditor, an increase over this year of \$7,560. This increase covers one new employee to assist the field examiner of this office in his examination of the books and other records of revenue-producing bureaus in the District government, and the transfer of four per diem employees to the annual roll who are now paid from appropriations under the control of the engineer's department.

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

Including a supplemental estimate of \$6,500, appropriations for salaries exceeding the amount for the present year by \$10,520 have been included in the bill. Two additional stenographers at \$1,440 each, made necessary by increased work in the office, are included in the increase. A supplemental amount of \$6,500 makes up most of the balance, to provide for an assistant to the corporation counsel who shall be an expert in public utilities law and practice. The corporation counsel is the general counsel of the Public Utilities Commission, and this commission urged that provision be made for the appointment of an assistant so skilled in the field of public utilities law as to be able adequately to handle the complex legal questions that are coming before the commission in increased number. The original departmental recommendation for this position was \$7,500. Under the law affected by the "average provision," however, any appointment made could not be at this rate of compensation. The average salary of the grade into which such a position would fall is \$7,000. Any appointment made could not exceed this average of \$7,000, and as this grade is already occupied by one assistant corporation counsel at \$7,000 the committee has recommended a salary of \$6,500 for this new position, which is at the minimum of the grade.

An amount of \$10,000, not considered in the Budget but added by the committee in the form of a legislative paragraph, is contained in the bill authorizing the employment of a special assistant to the corporation counsel to investigate the title of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. to certain lands, properties, and rights appurtenant thereto, and the said company's authority to occupy such lands. The lands in question are those through which the old Chesapeake & Ohio Canal used to operate.

EASTERN AND WESTERN MARKETS

An estimate of \$10,000 has been approved providing suitable sheds and facilities for the use of farmers retailing farm produce at the Eastern and Western Markets. At the present time no such apparatus is available, and during inclement weather in backing their vehicles up against the curb to display produce on the sidewalk the farmers undergo severe hardships. With the proposed sheds to be built this will be obviated.

FARMERS' PRODUCE MARKET

The act of Congress, approved March 2, 1929, entitled "An act authorizing the acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market, and for other purposes," approved the purchase or condemnation of all of squares 354 and 355 as a site for the said market, and also required

that within the amount of the limit of cost of \$300,000, all necessary work shall be performed, including the clearing and leveling of the ground and the erection thereon of protecting sheds and suitable stalls and stands. The estimate submitted of \$300,000, which proposed to expend \$225,000 for the purchase of the site, and \$75,000 for excavating, grading, improvements, etc., has been recommended.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

Salaries: An increase of \$7,960 brings the total for salaries under the highways department up to \$223,650. Three new positions are figured under this increase—an engineer of tests, at \$4,600, and two clerks, at \$1,800 and \$1,560, respectively, transferred from the office of the engineer department to the highways department. The service of the engineer inspector is to increase the department's efficiency in the analysis and control of materials entering into construction, both at the source of supply and manufacturing point.

Highway garage and shops and extension of auto repair shop: Last year a sum of \$205,000 was appropriated to provide for the removal of the highways department shops, etc., to the Bryant Street pumping station, and, in this connection, to make certain other desirable economical arrangements for servicing, repairing, and housing municipal automobiles. An amount of \$150,000 is carried in the bill this year to complete this program.

SEWER DEPARTMENT

A nominal increase to provide for the services of an assistant to the superintendent of sewers, at \$2,600 a year, and an amount of \$800 covering reallocations is included in the next year's budget for the sewer department, bringing the total for personal services up to \$196,600. The duties of the superintendent of sewers are manifold and the committee felt justified in recommending the new employee to relieve him of some of his less important burdens.

TREES AND PARKING

The sum of \$25,100 is contained in the bill for the salary item for the trees and parking service, which figure includes an additional foreman at \$1,620 per annum and \$400 to permit the salary of the superintendent to be increased to \$5,200 a year.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Six new positions are embraced in the appropriation recommended for the Public Utilities Commission's activities during the next fiscal year, including 1 senior engineer at \$4,600, 1 assistant engineer at \$2,600, 1 junior engineer at \$2,000, 1 accountant and auditor at \$3,200, and an assistant auditor and stenographer at \$2,000 and \$1,620, respectively. The committee has approved all of these positions in view of the increase in the importance and amount of work now coming before the commission for its decision. The total amount recommended for 1931 is \$92,620.

OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF TRAFFIC

Proposing 10 new positions under the office of the director of traffic, the Budget estimates for personal services amounted to \$53,540. Nine of these positions covered 1 chief examiner at \$1,800, 7 assistant examiners at \$1,620 each, and 1 traffic record clerk at \$1,440. With this civilian personnel it was proposed to supplant the policemen personnel who are now used to conduct the examinations of applicants for operators' permits. At the present time there are 12 policemen engaged in the office of the director of traffic, 9 conducting drivers' examinations, 1 acting as a liaison officer between the police force and the director of traffic, and 2 driving trucks carrying paint and supplies for the painting of signs, etc. Under the set-up that was proposed two per diem employees paid from the maintenance appropriation were to take the place of the two policemen now driving trucks, and the chief examiner was to take the place of the so-called liaison officer. The committee has disallowed the civilian positions proposed, recommending that nine policemen still be maintained in the traffic director's office for conducting these examinations. The committee suggests transferring the other three policemen back to the force for regular police work, following up the original idea of using two per diem employees for the truck-driving work, instead of using regular policemen at a salary range of from \$1,800 to \$2,100 for this work, and discontinuing the position of liaison officer as unnecessary.

The tenth position, that of storekeeper at \$1,800, now being held by a per diem employee, the committee has also disallowed, proposing that the work should continue to be done by a per diem employee.

The estimate for purchase and installation of traffic equipment, \$103,000 (an increase of \$59,300) has been approved. An additional \$38,000 necessary for installation of traffic signals absorbs most of the increase.

PUBLIC LIBRARY

Appropriations for the Free Public Library are carried under several different paragraphs. It was proposed in the Budget to amalgamate some of them under one head, which idea did not meet with the committee's approval. With the exception of a reduction of \$6,290 for proposed salary increases, the committee has approved the estimate submitted covering salaried positions for the various branches of the library service, and included over the Budget figure, a position at \$1,440,

for use as a carpenter for cabinet work, repairs to library stacks, etc. Eliminating the salary increase is consistent with the committee's action in nearly all parts of the bill, and explained heretofore.

In the purchase fund for the acquisition of books, the committee has added \$16,000 to the total, allowing for this purpose next year \$54,500. Testimony was presented indicating that the original figure was not sufficient to provide the needs of some of the branch libraries and hence the committee's action. An item of major importance contained in the Budget has been recommended in the bill. This is a sum of \$150,000 for building a branch library in the northeastern section of the city.

CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For the contingent and miscellaneous expenses for the District government, such as printing and binding, motor vehicles, postage, advertising, etc., the committee recommends a total of \$293,066, an increase of \$15,100 over this year, and an increase of \$5,000 over the Budget amount. Of this increase, \$10,150 is for the purchase of type-writing and calculating machines, perforating machines, adding machines, and remittance-control machines, to put into operation in the assessor's and collector's offices certain changes recommended by the General Accounting Office. The additional increase of \$5,000 is in the printing and binding fund of the department, distributed generally over the different bureaus and divisions.

MUNICIPAL CENTER PROJECT

Under the act of Congress approved February 28, 1929, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a municipal center in the District of Columbia," the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to acquire by purchase or condemnation all of squares 490, 491, and 533, and reservation 10, as a site for a municipal center, and to construct thereon necessary buildings to house municipal activities. Under the terms of a joint resolution, approved June 15, 1929 (Pub. Res. 17, 71st Cong.), \$3,000,000 was appropriated toward starting the purchase of land. About \$2,500,000 has been obligated up to the present time. It is estimated that about \$6,500,000 will be necessary to complete the purchase of the four squares. There is recommended in the bill a second \$3,000,000 to carry the project forward, which will leave a balance to be provided at a later date of \$500,000.

For the purpose of organizing a force of draftsmen for the preparation of plans and design of buildings to be used in the municipal center a sum of \$65,000 is recommended. It is proposed to employ about 14 draftsmen independent of the present force in the municipal architect's office, especially qualified on monumental work, devote approximately \$8,000 for the purchase of supplies and expend about \$9,000 for a model for the complete group of buildings to be erected in the four squares.

SEWERS

Showing a reduction under the present year of \$15,500, the committee has recommended \$1,472,500 for sewerage work in the District of Columbia next year. The appropriations remain the same with two exceptions. For suburban sewers \$675,000 has been recommended, being an increase of \$63,000, which will permit increased work for suburban construction in advance of street paving, both of which departments operate in close coordination under the present system. For assessment and permit work, which permits the construction of service sewers, so called because of the fact that these are the sewers which actually provide direct service to the abutting property, an amount of \$285,000 has been provided, which is \$55,000 less than this year and a reduction of \$35,000 less than the Budget figure. This reduction has been made because of sizable unexpended balances remaining available at the end of each fiscal year and the authority granted in the bill permitting these unexpended balances to be available for the ensuing fiscal year instead of lapsing into the Treasury as in the case of other appropriations.

COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL OF CITY REFUSE

For street cleaning, dust prevention, and disposal of refuse \$1,672,260 is recommended for 1931. This is an increase of \$58,360 over this year and an increase of \$28,880 over the Budget. The increases provide for two additional foremen for supervisory work on the streets, an increase of \$40,000 for dust prevention, cleaning, and snow removal, and \$15,000 for the disposal of refuse. An item originally contained in the District budget of \$550,000 for completing the construction of two high-temperature incinerators for the destruction of combustible refuse has been transferred from the District bill and incorporated in the first deficiency bill, due to the urgent need of this plant.

PLAYGROUNDS

For operation of the public playgrounds the bill carries \$288,060, which is an increase of \$30,000. The contingent expense fund absorbs \$29,000 of this increase, to be used in the construction of three field houses at a cost of \$3,000 each, and the remaining \$20,000 for the purpose of improving the municipal playgrounds. The balance of the increase (\$1,000) is for the purchase of additional supplies and school equipment.

ELECTRICAL DEPARTMENT

For salaries, lighting, etc., a total of \$1,131,720, an apparent reduction of \$8,710 under the present year, is contained in the bill. In 1930 an appropriation for lighting amounting to \$950,000 was made. For 1931 only \$915,000 was requested, but authority is recommended making an unexpended balance of \$84,750 available during 1931, which will make a total of \$999,750 available during next year, which it is believed is sufficient to maintain the existing lighting system and permit expansion in 1931 similar to that installed during 1930.

The committee has inserted a provision in the bill appropriating the sum of \$25,000 for the purpose of allowing the District electrical department's engineers to make a study of the power needs of the District of Columbia as to the desirability of establishing a municipally owned power plant in the city.

STREET AND ROAD IMPROVEMENT AND REPAIR

With the exception of two appropriation units, the amount recommended in the bill for repairs and improvements to the streets and roads in the District of Columbia remain unchanged from the figures in the Budget. The committee's action, reflected in totals, recommend an amount of \$4,078,000 for 1931, an increase over this year of \$239,600, and a decrease of \$182,900 under the Budget. The two major instances where the committee's recommendations varied from the Budget recommendations were the failure to include in the bill the estimate of \$211,000 for the elimination of the Fern Street grade crossing, and certain changes with reference to the street items under the gasoline tax, road, and street fund. The committee was not sympathetically inclined at this time to the expenditure of \$211,000 to construct an underpass under the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad tracks at Fern and Varnum Streets, when projects of more importance are pending.

With reference to improvements under the gasoline-tax fund, the committee's recommendations go above the Budget recommendations by \$45,100. This is brought about in this way: An item to repave Sixteenth Street NW., from Columbia Road to what is known as Tiger Bridge at a cost of \$136,000 has not been recommended. On its tour of the streets, the committee, while recognizing that the street at this juncture had rather a high crown in its center, and in places the gutters needed improvement, still was of the opinion that it was in adequate repair to carry Sixteenth Street traffic for one or possibly two more years. To offset this reduction the committee has inserted two major items, which it deemed of much more importance from a traffic standpoint than the item eliminated. These are the widening of H Street NW., from Seventh to Thirteenth, including the necessary sewer and water main connections, \$103,000, and the paving of New York Avenue NE., Florida Avenue to Bladensburg Road, \$195,000. The Budget contained an item of \$38,300 for grading New York Avenue between the above boundaries during 1931; but the committee was of the opinion that New York Avenue was an important enough traffic lane to go ahead with the paving at the same time. Nine other street items the importance of which no doubt was not apparent at the time the Budget was submitted have been included by the committee. These, at the behest of different citizens' organizations and after the committee had inspected their necessity.

About five years ago an amount was appropriated for a convenience station at Ninth and F Streets NW. Later the inadvisability of building a station at this point developed, and since that time (the amount having been reappropriated each year) at each point which has been selected some objection appeared or has been raised. The committee, therefore, this year, under the appropriations for the purchase of school and playground sites, has inserted language abandoning the building of such a station and reappropriated the money to be used for building sites for schools and playgrounds. A sum of \$7,000, in the maintenance fund for convenience stations, which had been carried in anticipation of the building of the above station has been taken out of the estimate.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Including supplemental estimates amounting to \$380,000, received after the estimates had been submitted in the annual Budget, the amount the committee had under consideration for the conduct of the public-school system in the District of Columbia for 1931 amounted to \$13,648,810. The amount the committee has recommended is \$13,651,530, an increase over the present year of \$1,666,930, and an increase over the Budget of \$2,720. In arriving at the amount carried in the bill, while it represents, as indicated, practically the amount submitted to the committee for its consideration, the committee did not, in many instances, accept the Budget figures on individual items, but made a number of changes. These changes are explained herewith in detail.

Salaries: For personal services of administrative and supervisory officers a total of \$669,500 was submitted, an increase of \$12,760. This increase proposed three new positions, the salary of a principal of the new Eliot Junior High School, to be ready some time the early part of 1931, and the salaries of two presidents for the two teachers' colleges at \$5,000 per annum each. The committee has recommended the salary of the principal. With reference to the teachers' colleges, it will be recalled that last year, when the District of Columbia appropriation bill was being considered by Congress, provision was made

that the section of the law existing at that time should be repealed, giving preference to graduates from the District normal schools in receiving teacher appointments. At the same time, in order to provide graduates from local normal schools with the same facility for training that, no doubt, would be possessed by many applicants competing from cities outside the District of Columbia, the Board of Education was authorized to expand the two existing normal schools into teachers' colleges, with a regular 4-year course. The estimate under the appropriation for the salaries of teachers provides for eight professors at an annual salary of \$4,000 a year each, to be used in the Wilson Teachers' College and the Miner Teachers' College, which the committee has approved. It was not the intention when these teachers' colleges were initiated by the legislation referred to, and the 3-year course extended to a 4-year course, that a faculty comparable to that necessary for a junior college should be instituted. The need is not now apparent, and the committee has refused to recommend the salaries for these proposed presidents.

Personal services of clerks and other employees: The estimates proposed seven additional clerks at \$1,440 a year, and one at \$480, to work part time. Two of these clerks were to be assigned to the proposed teachers' college presidents which, as already stated, the committee did not approve. The committee, therefore, did not recommend the salaries for these two clerks, and in addition reduced the amount an additional \$1,440, covering the position of a clerk formerly required in connection with the work of a supervising principal who is now retired and whose vacancy was not filled. Salary increases to the extent of \$2,180 have been eliminated.

SALARIES OF TEACHERS AND LIBRARIANS

For the payment of salaries of the teachers, librarians, and annual substitutes in the public-school system of the District of Columbia for the current year there was appropriated last year a total of \$5,982,600. This amount provided a force of 2,730 teachers, 10 librarians, and 24 annual substitutes.

The estimates submitted to the committee this year for the next fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, reached a total of \$6,272,000, and proposed a force of 2,768 teachers, 10 librarians, and 24 annual substitutes. This contemplated an increase of 30 elementary, junior-high, and high-school teachers, 8 professors for use in the 2 teachers' colleges, and additional allowance of \$300 per annum each to 20 assistant professors, also to be used in the teachers' colleges. The net increase in money as between this year and next was \$289,400—\$206,240, which is the net requirement for adjustments and increases of salaries, and \$83,160 for additional teachers, professors, and emoluments, as indicated.

The committee has recommended the sum of \$206,240 for longevity increases, which increases are fixed in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 4, 1924. It has not recommended the salary sum of \$83,160, although it approved 11 additional teachers instead of 30; it also approved the 8 professors at \$4,000 per annum each for the teachers' colleges, and eliminated the \$800 additional per annum to 20 assistant professors (class 3A teachers, at \$2,200 each) who are already teaching in these teachers' schools, upon the following basis:

During the hearings the committee conducted this year when the school officials were before it it was developed that the District of Columbia was greatly overstaffed with kindergarten teachers, and that while the average number of kindergarten pupils enrolled per teacher in all cities of 100,000 population or more in the United States (as shown by a statement issued by the United States Bureau of Education), was 57.9, the average in Washington was 31.8 kindergarten pupils per teacher. It was agreed by the school officials that by readjusting kindergartens to 2½-hour sessions instead of 3-hour sessions, each teacher to have two classes, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, and average not to exceed 55 pupils per day per teacher, and by abolishing underage kindergartens, that 7 classrooms and 78 teachers could be saved. At the present time, due to statutory prohibition, kindergarten teachers can not teach, although quite capable, even in the lower classes of the elementary schools. To obviate this restriction, the committee has inserted into the bill, and with acquiescence on the part of the school officials, the following legislative provision:

"Provided, That teachers employed in kindergartens are hereby made eligible for transfer to teach in grades 1 to 4, inclusive, of the elementary schools."

It is estimated that the effect of this language will be to make available for elementary-school purposes up to the fourth grade, inclusive, 78 excess kindergarten teachers, at a total saving in salaries of \$140,000, and it is the understanding between the school officials and the committee that these positions will be absorbed into the school system where and whenever possible before accepting new teachers from the normal-school eligibility list.

As has been stated, the estimates proposed 30 new elementary, junior high, and high-school teachers, and the committee, in recommending the total sum of \$6,188,840, propose 11 teachers, as follows:

The committee has recommended all teachers where they are to be used for new classrooms, and has disallowed all requested teachers where they were to be used for relieving heavy classes, upon the basis

of the average number of pupils per teacher in the different grades of public-school education, as shown in the following statement prepared by the United States Bureau of Education:

Average number of pupils per teacher, number of teachers employed, and number necessary as compared with other cities, for the school year ending June 30, 1928

[Prepared by the Office of Education, Department of Interior]

Schools	Average number of pupils enrolled per teacher		Number of teachers employed in Washington, D. C.	Number of teachers necessary to be comparable to all cities in Group 1	Average annual cost of instruction per pupil in average daily attendance	
	In all cities of 100,000 population or more	In Washington, D. C.			In cities of 100,000 population or more	In Washington, D. C.
Kindergarten.....	57.9	31.8	198	105	\$59.60	\$108.20
Elementary.....	37.5	33.2	1,530	1,355	75.81	85.80
Junior High.....	29.4	23.6	301	258	98.02	112.26
High.....	26.5	23.8	506	454	137.85	139.98
Vocational.....	24.6	16.8	50	34	168.39	201.93
Normal.....	20.2	13.6	46	31	239.40	252.25

A glance at this statement will show that in the kindergarten, elementary, junior high, high, vocational, and normal schools in all cities in the United States of 100,000 population or more, the District of Columbia stands in an extremely favorable light as regards the number of pupils per teacher. In fact, in each instance, the District is much below the average.

Eight teachers in class 1A at \$1,400 per annum were requested, 2 for two additional rooms at the Buchanan School, and 4 as additional teachers. The committee recommends the 2 teachers for the Buchanan School.

Four teachers in class 2A at \$1,800 per annum, additional junior high teachers which the committee does not recommend.

Six teachers in class 2A at \$1,800 per annum, and three teachers in class 2C at \$2,200 per annum, all requested in conjunction with the proposed opening on February 1, 1931, of the new Eliot Junior High School, all of which the committee does recommend.

Four teachers in class 2C at \$2,200 per annum and five teachers in class 3A at \$2,200 per annum, for readjustments in heavy classes, which the committee does not recommend.

Eight professors, at \$4,000, for the two teachers' colleges the committee recommends, but does not recommend, as stated heretofore, the proposed sum of \$8,000 to be distributed among 20 assistants as salary additions.

It is the committee's recommendation that only such new teachers as are indicated herein shall be added to the teaching force of the public-school system of the District of Columbia during the next fiscal year. Any money that remains in the appropriation, after complying with the provision respecting the use of kindergarten teachers in the elementary grades, shall not be used but shall be allowed to lapse.

Vacation schools and playgrounds: For the instruction and supervision of children in the vacation schools and playgrounds the sum of \$36,000 has been recommended, which is an addition of \$3,000 over this year. It is proposed with this increase to open two new summer junior high schools and provide three additional teachers in the Central High Summer School.

Community center department: For the work of the community center department the committee made a reduction in the estimate of \$3,000, bringing this appropriation back to \$42,000, the amount this department is operating under at the present time. The personnel will remain the same, the increase covering materials and equipment which were thought unnecessary.

Care of buildings and grounds: For the payment of salaries of the custodial staff of the public-school system the amount presented in the estimates was \$806,910, an increase of \$44,910. This increase embraced salary increases of \$20,020 (which have been disallowed) and 14 new positions as laborers, gardeners, etc., amounting to \$8,090. These positions have been recommended, nine of which are made necessary by the opening some time in the early part of 1931 of the new Eliot Junior High School. The balance represents a transfer of \$6,000 from an appropriation heretofore carried separately for care of smaller buildings and rented rooms.

Furniture, equipment, and supplies: When the hearings were conducted this year in connection with the purchase of furniture, equipment, and supplies by the school department, it was quite apparent to the committee that a proper spirit of economy in requisitioning different articles for school needs was lacking in the purchasing end of the school system. In fact, in many instances, it developed, after the committee had examined copies of a number of the requisitions that had been approved during the past year that expenditures for

articles were extravagant, and in some cases useless. The specifications on some of the requisitions were so drawn as to exclude proper competition among the several manufacturers of a specific article. This, because instead of having standards of types of equipment for the public schools, not infrequently the head of a particular school indicates a certain preference for some particular object, and the specification is so drawn. It was with this and the general inefficiency of the business end of the school system in mind that last year when the bill was under consideration the committee of its own volition included a salary in the bill for a so-called business manager to take over, under the superintendent of schools, but in cooperation with the commissioners the whole business administration. A joint meeting was held between the Senate and House subcommittees, the school board, and the school officials, and it was indicated clearly at that time that the committee was not satisfied with the existing business administration of the school system, and reasons stated why the salary for a business manager was included. Apparently, although every effort was made at the time, the committee did not make itself clear, because the same haphazard method of procedure in requisitioning furniture, equipment, and supplies, and the same organization maintained through which requisitions were approved, was in existence this year when the school officials were before the committee, as existed last year when the committee took the action indicated. It is for that reason this year that the committee has inserted in the bill a limitation to the effect that no money appropriated in the proposed bill for the purchase of furniture and equipment for the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be expended unless the requisitions of the Board of Education therefor shall be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The committee has reduced the estimate for furniture estimated for new school needs by \$10,100, believing the amount originally presented excessive. Under the paragraph for contingent expenses, etc., the committee has reduced the amount of \$50,000 for equipment and repair of equipment at Central and Dunbar High Schools by \$5,000, and eliminated the item of \$62,000 for stage equipment at the same schools.

Textbooks: A supplemental estimate of \$240,000 was presented for consideration for purchasing textbooks for high-school pupils in accordance with the recent act of Congress. Of this amount \$9,000 was for personal services. The committee has recommended a total of \$231,000 for textbooks, eliminating the \$9,000 for personal services.

BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

School buildings: Including supplemental estimates for additional school-building needs, the amount presented in the Budget this year for new school buildings, additions, etc., amounted to \$3,090,000. The committee has increased this amount, and there is recommended in the bill for the same purposes \$3,240,000. In considering the school-building needs of the District this year, the committee adopted the policy of eliminating all combination gymnasiums and assembly halls in the elementary schools that were proposed and using this money for the building of additional schoolrooms. The gymnasiums and assembly halls proposed in connection with junior high and high schools the committee recommended, and while it is not opposed to the gymnasiums and assembly halls in the elementary schools, it is of the opinion that where there is need for additional schoolrooms on one hand, and gymnasiums and assembly halls in elementary schools on the other, that the schoolrooms should take preference at this time. The building projects are as follows:

"Completion of construction of the Alice Deal Junior High School, \$300,000.

"For continuing the construction of a new school building for the Business High School, \$600,000.

"For the construction of two gymnasiums at the Gordon Junior High School there was an estimate of \$75,000. The committee approved this amount and added an additional \$180,000 for the construction of a 12-room addition.

"For the construction of an automobile-instruction shop on the grounds of the Columbia Junior High School, \$15,000.

"For the construction of a third story of eight rooms at the Powell Junior High School, including a gymnasium, \$225,000. It is understood when this is completed it will relieve the Monroe School, which school will be used for colored pupils.

"For the construction of a 4-room addition to the Congress Heights School, \$90,000. The original estimate for this project was \$130,000, which included a combination gymnasium and assembly hall, which for reasons heretofore stated the committee has not recommended.

"For the erection of a new platoon school building for colored pupils in northeast Washington, \$200,000. The committee added authority to permit the commissioners to enter into contracts for this building up to \$300,000.

"For the erection of a junior high school building in northeast Washington, \$200,000, with a limit of cost of \$500,000.

"For the construction of the Western High School athletic field, \$55,000, with a prior appropriation of \$45,000 made available for the same purpose.

"For the construction of a 4-room addition to the Deanwood School, \$50,000. This estimate originally was for a gymnasium and assembly hall, which the committee changed.

"For the construction of an 8-room addition to the Whittier School, \$150,000. This project was added by the committee.

"For the construction of an addition to the Stuart Junior High School, including 10 classrooms and 2 gymnasiums, \$240,000.

"For the erection of an 8-room extensible building at Northampton Street and Broad Branch Road, \$140,000. The estimate was for \$200,000, which included a gymnasium and assembly hall.

"For the erection of an 8-room extensible building in Wesley Heights, \$140,000. The estimate for this contemplated only four rooms, at \$80,000, which the committee increased.

"For the erection of a 4-room extensible building at Tenth and Franklin Streets NE., \$80,000.

"For the construction of a 12-room addition to the Anthony Bowen School at First and M Streets SW., \$200,000."

School building and playground sites: The original estimate for the school building and playground site fund was \$300,700. The committee has increased this amount to \$360,700. A total of seven different sites to be purchased under this recommended appropriation are listed in the bill to cost a total of \$300,700. Two unexpended balances of prior appropriations are made available for a site-purchasing fund, and in addition to this the committee has added \$60,000 in the appropriation of \$300,700, and has reappropriated a sum of \$39,793, originally appropriated for a convenience station, to be available for school and playground sites. This will make available altogether as a separate fund for purchase of sites \$139,793.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

For the conduct of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia there has been recommended a sum of \$3,127,695, an increase of \$43,745 over this year, and a reduction of \$7,850 under the amount contained in the Budget. Contemplating a total force of 1,279 men there is set aside an allotment of \$2,762,880 for the pay and allowances of 1 superintendent, 2 assistant superintendents, 4 inspectors, 15 captains, 39 lieutenants, 57 sergeants, and 1,162 privates. After the regular budget was submitted to Congress an additional amount of \$37,800 was received, which the committee approved, and which adds 14 additional lieutenants to the force. The purpose of this addition is to permit the appointment of one lieutenant to each of the 14 police precincts within the confines of the District. Under the present system each precinct is officered by a captain and a lieutenant, one remaining on duty for 10 and the other 14 hours daily over the 24-hour period. With these additionally acquired lieutenants it will permit the shifts to be divided into three equal 8-hour periods and thus put the officers of the force upon the same working basis as that which affects the privates.

For the civilian personnel of the department the committee has eliminated an amount of \$1,470 for salary increases, and has added \$2,500 for the appointment of a photographer for work in the bureau of identification. Under the contingent expense item the committee has increased the appropriation by \$3,000 to permit an amount for tuition and training in bullet proof identification and ballistics. The amount for uniforms for the police force has been increased commensurately following the recommendation for the 14 additional lieutenants mentioned.

For the maintenance of a suitable place for the reception and detention of girls and women over 17 years of age, the committee has eliminated the item of \$11,000 for rent, and reduced the item for food and groceries by \$1,750. The committee was assured proper quarters could be obtained in some section of the municipal-center project, purchase and condemnation of property for which is being carried on under appropriations which have been and will be made by Congress. The reduction of the food allowance was made with the idea that the home, wherever it is established, could be operated upon a more economical basis during the next fiscal year and the extra vacancies now manifest be eliminated.

Attention is invited to that portion of the hearings conducted by the committee, when the police officials were before it, with reference to the educational requirements of applicants for police positions. The mental qualifications necessary under existing practice successfully to pass one of these examinations are much below those of an average graded-school education. The committee was of the opinion that if these qualifications were raised the position would attract men of a higher caliber. The department indorsed this impression and agreed, in cooperation with the Civil Service Commission, to endeavor to raise the mental standard to an equivalent of a high-school education. Whether this can be done successfully or not, of course, must wait until it is given a trial. In this connection, however, the committee has inserted a provision in the bill requiring any applicant for the position of private in the Metropolitan police force of the District after July 1, 1930, to possess an eighth-grade common-school education.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

For the various activities under the health department a total of \$467,170 is recommended, an increase of \$34,980 over this year and an

increase of \$10,040 over the estimates presented to Congress in the Budget.

Under the appropriation unit "Salaries" the committee has eliminated all of the salary increases with the exception of \$500, for the District health officer, has recommended an additional sanitary inspector at \$1,800, and a microscopist chemist at \$3,800, the purpose of which position is to provide services in the health department to assist the police department in criminal investigations.

Under the appropriating paragraph for the conduct of hygiene and sanitation work in the public schools, including the necessary expenses of maintaining free dental clinics, the Budget estimate contained an amount for the installation of one additional clinic. The committee increased this estimate by \$8,180 to provide for another clinic for the colored population of the District. The only other change in the estimates for the health department of consequence is the addition of \$1,200 suggested by the committee for a photomicrographic outfit in the appropriation for maintenance of laboratories. This is in connection with investigations to be conducted in the chemical laboratory, the bacteriological laboratory, and the serological laboratory of the health department for the police department.

Providing for the same force of men that the fire department is now operating under, the bill carries a total amount of \$2,253,840 for 1931. This is an increase over the present year of \$82,050, all of which increase is absorbed in an item in the bill appropriating \$150,000 for a site for a new engine company in the vicinity of Thirteenth and K Streets NW. For additional fire-fighting apparatus the bill carries a total of \$38,000, providing for the acquisition of 1 ambulance, 1 aerial hook and ladder truck, 1 pumping engine, triple combination, and 1 combination hose wagon, all motor driven.

COURTS AND PRISONS

For the District courts, their expenses, and the support of convicts of the District of Columbia a total of \$852,240 has been recommended for the year 1931. This amount reflects an increase of \$7,300 over the present year and a decrease of \$11,600 under the Budget estimates.

Juvenile court: The committee has eliminated \$1,120 from the salary roll covering minor salary increases, making a total budget for the juvenile court for 1931 of \$65,240.

Police court: An amount of \$142,440 is contained in the bill covering salaries and expenses for the police court for next year, a reduction of \$2,240 under the Budget estimate. This decrease includes an additional clerk at \$1,620, which the committee thought unnecessary, and the balance salary increases. The committee struck out of the bill the language providing \$300 additional for the presiding judge, which will put all four judges on an equal salary basis at \$8,000 a year.

Municipal court: The committee has approved an amount of \$81,670 for salaries and expenses of the municipal court of the District of Columbia for 1931. This is an increase of \$2,780 over the present year, all of which increase is reflected in the appropriation for salaries. Under the present allocation of salaries for the five municipal judges the presiding judge receives \$7,300, two receive \$7,000, and two \$6,500. It is the committee's opinion that these salaries all should be on a parity with the salaries of the police-court judges, which is \$8,000 apiece. But, due to the differences in reallocation this is impossible. The committee has, however, excluded these positions from the "average" clause in the bill and included enough money to bring all of them up to the maximum of their grade, \$7,500.

Supreme court: The appropriations for the supreme court, fees of witnesses, and jurors, and the probation system remain the same in the bill as those that are running currently. The estimate for pay of bailiffs proposed an increase of two bailiffs and one crier. The committee saw no necessity for these additional positions, and the testimony divulged no information to the contrary. The increased amount of \$5,760 was accordingly stricken from the bill, which also included some small salary increases. The estimate for the care of the courthouse proposed an additional watchman, which has not been recommended, the committee seeing no necessity for his services.

Court of appeals: The estimate for salaries, court of appeals, proposed an amendment of \$3,160 for salary set-ups, which, with the exception of \$600 allowed for the salaries of the secretaries to the three justices, has been disallowed. The \$600 will provide \$200 each and will bring their salary up to the level of \$2,600, the same salary rate applied to the secretaries of the justices of the supreme court.

BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE

For the various activities under the Board of Public Welfare for 1931, there is reported in the bill a sum amounting to \$5,083,917, which is an increase of \$576,837 over this year, and a decrease of \$36,010 under what was recommended in the Budget. An estimate of \$30,000, which originally was presented in the District budget, has been transferred from this bill to the first deficiency bill, now pending in the Senate, which was to establish a laundry at the workhouse and reformatory and provide for the necessary equipment, in order to do the Federal laundry for the various executive departments in the city. Further, a supplemental estimate of \$20,000 has been included in the salary item for Gallinger Municipal Hospital. This inclusion has been made necessary because, since the submission of the budget for 1931,

it has been disclosed that the estimate of appropriation for this purpose contemplated deductions from the salaries of certain employees on account of subsistence and quarters to be furnished them, whereas later it was ascertained that these employees will not be subsisted and quartered at the hospital, and hence should receive their salaries without such deductions.

Personal services: Two new positions were listed in the estimate submitted, one a social-service worker at \$1,800 and the other a stenographer at \$1,440. The committee has allowed the first and eliminated the second, including any salary increases.

Board and care of children: The committee recommends for this purpose for next year \$235,000. The Budget estimate contemplated an increase of \$10,000, one-half of which was recommended by the committee, making an increase of \$5,000 over the present year.

Receiving home: The committee reduced this estimate by \$750, an amount which was carried last year for the purchase of an automobile, no need for which exists during 1931. The money for salary step-ups has been left in the bill for the 14 employees at the receiving home, all of them being at the minimum salary rate of the grade.

District jail: For salaries at the District jail, the committee recommends \$76,710, a reduction of \$2,700 under the estimate. Three new positions, including a night nurse for the infirmary were included in the Budget figure. This last position has been eliminated, the committee feeling such duties very properly could be performed by an inmate at the institution or by assignment in necessary cases from Gallinger Hospital. The estimate for maintenance and support of prisoners is approved, amounting to \$77,000. The balance of the decrease, \$1,080, covers salary increases.

Workhouse and reformatory: The next fiscal year the appropriation for salaries at both the workhouse and reformatory are recommended to be carried in one fund instead of separately as heretofore. This will tend toward better administration. The Budget estimate in all of the following instances has been recommended: Maintenance, \$275,000, which, being a combination of the fuel item heretofore carried separately, shows an actual increase of \$28,500; continuing construction of permanent buildings, \$125,000, an increase of \$40,000, \$60,000 to be allocated at the workhouse, \$55,500 at the reformatory for the general institution buildings, and \$9,500 for the extension of the foundry building. A new item of \$150,000 for commencing construction of buildings and inclosing walls, to provide for the custody of such prisoners as should be confined within a walled inclosure is also included. The reformatory is an open institution. Heretofore the more dangerous prisoners convicted in the District of Columbia were sent to the Federal institutions at Atlanta and Leavenworth.

Because of crowded conditions there, the District has been requested to take care of all its own prisoners, hence the need for a walled inclosure. For remodeling and arrangement of the power, heating, and lighting facilities, \$87,500 has been recommended; and an appropriation also suggested of \$50,000 for the working-capital fund to provide industrial enterprises for the inmates. Until now this fund has been drawn from the general appropriations for these institutions and later reimbursed from receipts from the sale of such articles manufactured. A specific appropriation tends toward a more orderly and businesslike procedure and better administration of the fund.

National Training School for Girls: This appropriation has been reduced for next year by a total of \$11,240, making an available total of \$68,000, \$30,000 for personal services, a reduction of \$9,240, and \$38,000 for maintenance, a reduction of \$2,000. Authority has been given the Board of Public Welfare to transfer girls confined in the branch of the National Training School for Girls at Muirkirk, Md., and confine them in the National Training School for Girls on the Conduit Road in the District of Columbia. The school at Muirkirk is for white girls and the school at the Conduit Road branch for colored girls. The latter institution is large enough to accommodate both classes, where they will be confined in entirely separate units. The committee felt that this should be done in the interest of economy, hence the reductions in the amounts proposed.

Medical charities: Under this title there is appropriated annually the District's contributions to five following hospitals: Children's, Emergency, Eastern, Washington Home for Incurables, and the Columbia Women's. The respective amounts recommended this year for 1931 are \$22,000, \$30,000, \$18,000, \$10,000, and \$15,000. The amounts for Eastern and Emergency represent an increase over this year of \$3,000 and \$5,000.

Tuberculosis Hospital: For this institution there is recommended a total next year of \$143,800, a slight increase to permit of the employment of one medical technician at \$1,800 and two domestic attendants.

Gallinger Municipal Hospital: For the various expenses attendant upon the operation of this institution a round sum of \$717,050 is contained in the bill, which is within \$8,450 more than the current year. Of this amount \$325,300 is set aside for personal services. The Budget estimate was \$310,300, contemplating 1 chief social-service worker, at \$2,600; 3 social-service workers, at \$1,800; 1 X-ray technician, at \$1,440; 1 stenographer, at \$1,440; and 2 internes, at \$660. Increases in salaries to the extent of \$5,000 were also included. The committee eliminated the four social-service workers and the salary increases,

allowing the other positions. These workers are at present at the institution, being paid by private donation. The committee is of the opinion that with an institution of this nature, which is practically a charitable organization paid from District funds, these employees should continue to be maintained in this manner. In a visit to the institution this fall by several members of the committee, need was expressed for higher-paid and better-qualified physicians in the psychiatric wards. The committee, therefore, has put into the bill a sum of \$8,000, \$5,600 of which is for a psychiatrist and \$2,400 to add to the salaries of the present medical positions in the expectation of obtaining more experienced doctors. Last year a sum of \$150,000 was appropriated for the construction of a nurses' home with a capacity of 150 nurses, under a contract authorization of \$325,000. In this bill the additional sum of \$175,000 has been added for its completion.

District Training School: A total amount of \$324,250 is in the bill for this school, an increase of \$36,500 over 1930. This amount is distributed as follows: \$76,000 for personal services; \$80,000 for maintenance and other necessary expenses; \$22,000 for repairs and improvements; \$130,000 for the construction of a domestic-service building; and \$8,500 for furnishings and equipment for employees' building and superintendent's residence. The Budget estimate has been decreased by \$2,420 covering salary increases.

St. Elizabeths Hospital: For the support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, as provided by law, there is recommended to be appropriated for the next fiscal year a sum of \$1,715,472, an increase over this year of \$143,472. This covers increased expenses and an increased contribution toward the District population of the hospital.

DISTRICT MILITIA

The sum for the expenses of the District militia remains practically the same in the bill for the next fiscal year, \$53,900, a slight increase of \$1,000 being absorbed by an increase of \$1,000 in the pay of troops other than Government employees.

RECLAMATION OF ANACOSTIA FLATS

For continuing the work under the approved project for reclamation of Anacostia River Flats, District of Columbia (as set forth in S. Doc. 37, 68th Cong., 1st sess.), there is contained in the bill a sum of \$330,000. Of this amount, \$180,000, which is the same amount as has been appropriated for the past two years, will be devoted strictly to reclamation work, and \$150,000 for the purchase of land. With the completion of reclamation work in this fiscal year with available funds, the project will be approximately 67 per cent completed, and with the funds proposed for 1931 will be approximately 74 per cent completed by January 30, 1931. The \$180,000 for 1931 will be expended as follows:

Trenching and levee construction, section G (section G is the upper section of the project between Benning Bridge and the District line).....	\$40,000
Sea-wall foundations, section G.....	73,000
Dredging, section G.....	60,000
Supervision of dump fills.....	4,000
Miscellaneous surveys.....	3,000
Total.....	180,000

The appropriation of \$150,000 proposed for the purchase of land is made necessary by reason of the decision of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in which the high-water line, to which the United States claims possession, was so established as to require the purchase of 184 acres of land in addition to that covered by the original estimates.

It is estimated that if the rate of \$180,000 annually for reclamation work is maintained for the remainder of the work, that it will be approximately seven years before the project for reclamation of the Anacostia River Flats is completed to the District line.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS

The amount recommended for personal services is \$405,000, identical to that which is carried for this year. The Budget proposed that \$414,500 should be appropriated, covering an additional laborer at \$1,143, and \$8,357 for salary increases, but these two items the committee did not recommend.

Improvement and care of parks: The full amount recommended in the Budget for the improvement and care of the parks in the District of Columbia is presented in the bill, \$687,555, an increase over this year of \$117,555. Of this increase \$86,500 will be used in the ordinary maintenance of the parks, \$12,755 for improvement of Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, making a total available for 1931 for this purpose \$134,755, \$3,000 for lights in Rock Creek Park, \$10,000 for improvement of new reservations, and \$14,300 for the improvement of a portion of Borroughs Recreation Center at Eighteenth and Otis Streets NE., to make it available for recreational purposes.

PARK POLICE

Involving an increase of five additional men, the sum of \$162,120 has been recommended for the park police for 1931, an increase of \$10,120 over this year. The need for these men is apparent, as each year additional park area is acquired. This will bring the number of the force up to 77 men. The uniform allowance has been increased commensurately.

NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

The expenses for the operation of the Zoological Park next year have been increased by \$17,000, making a total amount available of \$220,000. This increase covers some additional employees and generally increased expenses. Last year an appropriation was made of \$220,000 for the construction of a public exhibition building for reptiles. After submitting bids for the project it has been found that the estimate submitted was too low and that it will require about \$28,000 additional properly to carry out the construction. Accordingly, the committee has recommended this amount to be appropriated.

WATER SERVICE

For the general services operating under the water department of the District of Columbia, and payable from water revenues, there is recommended a total of \$1,690,940, an increase of \$195,110 over the present year and an increase of \$43,080 over the estimate submitted in the Budget. Involved in these figures is a transfer of 11 per diem employees to the annual roll. These 11 positions have been in existence for a number of years, and are occupied by employees who perform duties corresponding to duties performed by other employees on the annual roll. The committee, therefore, thought it only fair they should be carried on the permanent roll, and an amount of money covering their salaries was transferred from one appropriation unit to another in order to accomplish this purpose.

The committee increased the estimate for installing and repairing water meters by adding \$25,000, after testimony showed that the original estimate of \$70,000 was insufficient. The committee likewise increased the estimate for the purchase of a 20,000,000-gallon pump at the Bryant Street pumping station from \$75,000 to \$92,000 when it was informed that this latter amount would be necessary.

WATER RATES

District officials advised the committee during the hearings this year that if the money was expended as outlined in the Budget for 1931 under the present water rates their budget would fall about \$100,000 short of their receipts. In view of this condition, the committee has proposed a legislative paragraph to the bill to correct it by raising the water rates to the consumers in the District of Columbia.

At the present time the District of Columbia's water system, consisting of the supply branch, under jurisdiction of the War Department, and the distribution branch under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is entirely supported by appropriations payable from the water fund, derived from the sale of water to private consumers and from assessments collected for the laying of service water mains. The revenues derived from these two sources are inadequate to provide for the extensions and betterments in the water system necessary to furnish an adequate water supply for projected future consumption and at the same time meet the necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the supply and distribution branches.

A board of engineers from the United States Engineer's office and the water department of the District of Columbia, the two agencies responsible for the supply and distribution of water in the District of Columbia, recently completed a joint study of the water system which resulted in the formulation of a 5-year construction and maintenance program of extensions and improvements, considered to be absolutely essential and necessary safely and adequately to provide for the future growth of the city projected over a period of five years. This program, which is subject to annual revision, has been tentatively approved by the Commissioners of the District and involves the expenditure of approximately \$2,000,000 per annum, which can not be met from the present revenues derived from existing water rents and assessments for service mains.

The hearings before the committee contain tables showing in detail the existing rates in the District and in 27 other cities with populations from 5,000,000 to 100,000, having municipal water systems. These tables show that the existing charge in the District for an average domestic consumption of 10,000 cubic feet of water is 67 per cent less than the average of the 27 cities which were investigated, and that with the increase proposed in the bill, the rates in the District for the average domestic consumption of 10,000 cubic feet would still be 24 per cent less than the average of these 27 cities. The hearings also contain a table showing that the existing water-main assessment of \$2 per front foot has returned in the past five years only 55.5 per cent of the amount expended for service-main extensions.

The proposed increase in the rates and water-main assessment is only sufficient to provide for carrying out the 5-year program and, while the percentage of increase for the domestic consumer is larger than the percentage of increase for the large commercial consumer, the proposed rates are thought to be equitable by the committee, since the large commercial consumers, representing only 5 per cent of the total number of consumers, pay 50 per cent of the revenue derived from the sale of water.

On an appropriation and revenue basis, the water fund of the District of Columbia at the beginning of the fiscal year 1931 shows a revenue deficit of \$18,617.71. If the water rates are not increased the

5-year program of extensions and betterments necessary to provide a safe and adequate water supply for the District can not be carried out, and, as stated, a revenue deficit at the close of the fiscal year 1931 of \$97,747.81 will result.

Following is a statement which will show in figures the distribution of revenue for present and proposed water rates and assessment which will be brought about if the legislation proposed by the committee is enacted into law:

Distribution of revenue for present and proposed water rates and assessment

Number of consumers	Class	Present rate	Increase in rate	New rate	Per cent of increase	Estimated revenue 1931, present rate	Additional revenue from increase	Total net revenues 1931, increased rate
70,000	Minimum meter, domestic.....	\$6.36	\$2.39	\$8.75	37.6	\$418,000	\$167,300	\$585,300
5,000	Minimum meter, commercial.....	6.36	2.39	8.75	37.6	31,800	11,900	43,700
41,700	Over 7,500 cubic feet, domestic.....	.06	.01	.07	16.6	120,000	20,000	140,000
4,100	Over 7,500 cubic feet, commercial.....	.06	.01	.07	16.6	600,200	99,800	700,000
	Total.....					1,170,000	299,000	1,469,000
14,000	Flat rate, minimum residence.....	7.03	2.82	9.85	40.1	147,000	54,400	201,400
	Total.....					1,317,000	353,400	1,670,400
	Water main assessments.....	2.00	1.00	3.00	50.0	175,000	96,000	271,000
	Total.....					1,492,000	449,400	1,941,400
	Building purposes:							
	Per 1,000 brick.....	.03	.03	.06				
	Per cubic yard concrete.....	.018	.015	.03	100.0	5,400	4,000	9,400
	Total.....					1,497,040	453,400	1,950,800
	Virginia.....					50,000		50,000
	Total.....					1,547,400		2,000,800

Revenue from water meters in the District of Columbia

Distribution of revenue	District of Columbia meters (domestic)	Private meters (commercial)	Flat rate (consumers)
Revenue.....	\$725,300	\$743,700	\$201,400
Per cent of revenue, present rate.....	40.8	47.9	11.1
Per cent of revenue, increased rate.....	43.3	44.4	12.0
Per cent of consumers.....	78.6	5.6	15.7

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY].

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee has discussed with you the items in this bill, with the exception of the police department. It is my intention to confine my remarks to the Metropolitan police force, but before entering on that discussion, prompted by the questions of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KERCHAM], and perhaps others, with reference to the attitude of the committee and the Congress generally toward the District of Columbia, and with reference to the opinion of the committee respecting the efficiency with which the various employees of the District of Columbia are discharging their public duty, I feel that I should give to this committee at least my own opinion, and I believe to a considerable extent it is the opinion of the subcommittee, that taking it all in all there is no city in the United States that is enjoying the advantages from its city government that the citizens of the District of Columbia enjoy at the hands of the government of the District of Columbia. Two things are responsible for that. First, there is the contribution that the National Government makes to the District, and which is made to no other American city, and the other is the efficient and capable public servants that are in the District government. As I have served on this subcommittee I have, from year to year, for my own satisfaction and for my own use, undertaken to classify the various departments and the heads of the various departments with reference to the efficiency and economies that they use in the discharge of their obligations.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. In what particular does the gentleman say that the citizens of the District of Columbia are enjoying better advantages than those of any other city? I am willing to set up my city of Baltimore against the District of Columbia at any time.

Mr. HOLADAY. I realize that the city of Baltimore, judging by its Representative here on the floor, no doubt has a very capable city organization.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I thank the gentleman for his compliment; but, for instance, we have been trying for years to get a proper sewage-disposal plant for the city of Washington, instead of having the sewage dumped into the Potomac River. In Balti-

more they would not allow us to do that, and we would not wish it. We have a proper disposal plant to take care of sewage costing millions of dollars. Yet here in the District of Columbia you pollute the Potomac River constantly, and are destroying all of the fish. It is not just to Maryland nor the District. Something should be done to remedy this condition.

Mr. HOLADAY. Some steps along that line are taken in this bill, contemplating the disposal of the sewage not only of the District of Columbia but, I think, also taking care of the sewage of some of the municipalities or neighborhoods in the adjoining State of Maryland.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am very much in favor of this great city and of its people enjoying what is coming to them, but it does seem to me that if the trade bodies and the newspapers here would come with a spirit of friendliness and cooperation to Congress, they would get what they are entitled to; but instead they are always criticizing and particularly jumping on the gentleman's committee. I do not understand why the gentleman and my friend from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] want to stay on a committee like this. When I pick up the newspapers and read the headlines they are constantly being criticized.

I look on you folks as being rather liberal minded, and I would like you to tell us just what you do for the city of Washington so that we may try to get this controversy between the city and Congress settled in some way.

Mr. HOLADAY. Perhaps the members of the committee belong to that class of citizens who enjoy being jumped on.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I might suggest to my friend in answer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] that he call attention to the tax rate existing in the city of Washington and compare that with the tax rate of any other city of its size in the United States. I think that in itself would indicate that Congress has been in the past mighty good to the people of Washington.

Mr. HOLADAY. In the time that I have at my disposal I am not going into that question, but I will make this statement, which is my well-considered opinion, and I think it can be justified. The taxpayer of the District of Columbia receives more for the dollar that he pays in taxes than does the taxpayer of any other municipality in the United States.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I wonder if the gentleman could be more explicit and state the tax rate that exists in the city of Washington.

Mr. HOLADAY. One dollar and seventy cents.

Mr. WOODRUFF. On a 50 per cent valuation?

Mr. HOLADAY. On a 100 per cent valuation.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Even at 100 per cent valuation I say that in any other city of the size of Washington in the United States I doubt if the tax rate is less than \$3.50.

Mr. HOLADAY. I think there is no question about that. I think the tax rate here is lower than in any other comparable city.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. There is a proposal here now that in addition to Bolling Field and to the naval air station, the United States Government lend to the District government two and a half million dollars to construct a municipal airport; whereas down in my city, when we wanted an air-mail stop, the Commerce Department and the Post Office Department said, "All right, we will stop the planes there, provided you establish an airport and light it." And in order to light it and establish the air-mail port we expended \$55,000, and it came partly out of the city funds and the county funds, but mostly out of the pockets of the citizens of that community, who contributed enough cash to furnish that airport in order that we might have the facilities of air mail.

Mr. HOLADAY. Gentlemen, I know of only three or four departments of the District government that I would especially criticize. One of them is the school system, which the chairman of the committee [Mr. SIMMONS] has discussed. Another one is the municipal architect's office, which in my opinion is not functioning satisfactorily. Another is the Department of Public Inspection of Buildings, and so forth. But, I may say right here that a new man is in charge of it, and a new organization scheme is being worked out, and I hope in another year we shall see a considerable improvement in that division.

Along with the two or three or four departments of the District government which are subject to criticism there are a number of departments which I believe are as efficiently managed as you will find departments managed in any other city in the United States. In Mr. Daniel J. Donovan, the auditor, we have an efficient man. In Mr. William P. Richards, the assessor, we have another one. In Maj. D. A. Davison, Maj. L. E. Atkins, and Capt. Hugh P. Oram, the assistants to the engineer commissioner, we have very efficient men.

And let me say that Major Atkins, who is leaving the service now in a few days, is the man who has charge of the purchase of real estate, and the record that has been made in the purchase of real estate, as mentioned on the floor a few days ago by the Speaker of this House, is in large degree due to the efficient efforts of Major Atkins. He has saved to the District of Columbia through that capable work not only thousands of dollars, but hundreds of thousands of dollars; and, gentlemen, within the next hour you will have the opportunity of voting on the proposition as to whether you want to sustain Major Atkins and the policy that he has been pursuing, or whether or not you want to turn the thing wide open to the class of people who have been mentioned here, whose business it is to sell property to the District irrespective of its value. In Capt. H. C. Whitehurst, at the head of the highway department; Mr. J. B. Gordon, the sanitary engineer; Mr. George F. Bowerman, the librarian; Dr. William C. Fowler, the head of the health department; Mr. George S. Wilson, director of public welfare; and George S. Watson, chief of the fire department, we find efficient and worthy public servants.

In the daily press the Washington police force has been designated throughout the United States as the worst police department in the United States. In my opinion that designation is entirely without justification. The police force here is not what it should be and it is not what it can be made without any material increase in cost. But it is not the worst police department in the United States.

What I say this afternoon in the nature of criticism of the police department is intended to be constructive, and I hope it will be considered as constructive criticism. The unsatisfactory conditions that exist in our police department here is due in great part to four conditions. The first is the low qualification of those entering the service. The second is the lack of proper organization; third, lack of scientifically trained personnel and adequate equipment; and fourth, the delay in the criminal courts in the trial of cases.

I want to discuss the first of those four conditions, namely, the low qualification of those entering the service. Word came to our committee that certain of our judges were objecting to the educational qualifications of certain policemen, that policemen were not able intelligently to write. We commenced an investigation. We first called in the chief of police, and he admitted that while the conditions might not be as bad as the complaint stated, there was still room for improvement. But he said: "These men come to me from the Civil Service Commission. I must select the policemen from the eligible list that is handed to me by the Civil Service Commission." We called in a representative of the Civil Service Commission. We asked him numerous questions, and he said, "All the men on that list have successfully passed the examination." Then, when we pursued the questions a little further I was reminded of a

story concerning a condition that existed a few weeks ago in a college not far from Washington.

The membership of the House may remember that not long ago the Carnegie Foundation made an investigation of professionalism in the colleges and universities of our country. They severely criticized the standing of a certain college. The president of a college that had been criticized commenced an investigation. He discovered that the coach of the football team was the registrar of the college, and he called him in and said to him: "How is it that all these men are in college? What are their qualifications to enter?" And the coach said: "They have all passed the examination." The president of the college said: "What kind of an examination do you give them?" The coach answered: "A written examination."

The president of the college, referring to a big fellow who had successfully played guard on the football team, said to the coach: "What kind of an examination did that man pass?" The coach said: "Well, on the last examination when that man passed we asked him two questions, and we required a percentage of 50 to pass the examination. The first question which was asked that man was, 'What is the color of blue litmus paper?' and he replied, 'Red.' That was wrong.

"The second question was, 'What is electricity?' and he replied: 'I don't know,' and that was correct." [Laughter.]

We found there were absolutely no educational qualifications whatever required of a man before he could take the civil-service examination. No question was asked. The testimony was that a great many of these men come in to take the examination with second-grade educations. No entrance qualification, so far as schooling is concerned, was required at all; there was no investigation with reference to their character.

The only examination that was made with reference to their previous condition was a fingerprint taken and compared with the fingerprints in the Department of Justice so that if a man had served at some time in the penitentiary that fact would be discovered. The examination consisted of asking certain questions. A sample of the questions asked a man, who is not required to be able to write, is as follows—I will read the questions as furnished by the Civil Service Commission:

Which of the following is the chief reason why a police department is necessary:

1. To enforce law and order.
2. To control traffic.
3. To prevent criminals from escaping from jail.
4. To record fingerprints.
5. To direct strangers.

The applicant had to check the question or proposition that he thought was of the greatest importance.

With an examination of that kind and without any examination as to his character or his previous mode of living, his name was certified to the chief of police. The civil-service representative testified that they were inaugurating a new system, whereby they hoped to make some inquiries with reference to the former condition of living and the former record of the applicants.

With that list before him the chief of police was then compelled to make what investigation he could make. The committee was of the opinion that the police force of this city in the years to come would be improved by an educational qualification, and so there has been written into this bill a limitation requiring that a man, in order to be eligible for examination, shall have completed the equivalent of an eighth-grade education.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I believe that at the salaries paid and at the hours of labor required there can be secured for the Metropolitan police force men with not only eighth-grade prerequisites but young men who are graduates of high schools. I think no one will deny that in an individual case now and then a man who is not able to read and write will be found who will make a better policeman than some man who is a graduate of a college. But, taking the general average of 100 or 1,000, the higher the educational requirements the higher the type of officer secured.

That is the provision which is made with reference to improving the quality of the applicants.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I am unable to find any provision that the equivalent of an eighth-grade common-school education will permit an applicant to appear for an examination. It is stated in the bill, "who have not completed an eighth-grade common-school education." The only way to prove that would be to get a certificate from a common school.

Mr. HOLADAY. No; I think not. A certificate from a public school or a private school or a certificate from a private tutor would meet this requirement.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Does the gentleman realize that if the proviso becomes law, that outstanding hero of the World War—Sergeant York—could not become a member of the police force of the District of Columbia?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes. I expect that is the fact.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Does not the gentleman know that if the Constitution of the United States had contained that requirement as one of the qualifications of a Member of Congress, there would have been a number of men who would not have been able to serve as Members of Congress?

Mr. HOLADAY. But we are talking about the Washington police force.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. And I am asking about qualifications of Members of Congress also.

Mr. HOLADAY. What the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] says is probably true, and that is the reason I pointed out a moment ago the exception. You can find an exception to every general rule, but we must deal with the general average. I believe we are not asking too much when we say to a man who is about to enter the police force at a salary of \$1,800, or \$1,900 if the salary increase is approved, with his chances of advancement, in order to give efficient public service to the citizens, he shall prepare himself with at least an eighth-grade education.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield.

Mr. ROMJUE. Does the gentleman know whether or not any municipality in the United States maintains any training school for police officers?

Mr. HOLADAY. I can not give the gentleman any definite information on that. Various cities have various methods of training.

Mr. ROMJUE. That question occurred to me some time ago. We read so much and hear so much about nonenforcement of the law that I think it is just as highly important that a police official be trained before he goes into the service as it is for a doctor, a lawyer, or any other professional man to be trained.

Mr. HOLADAY. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. ROMJUE. I believe that if the various municipalities throughout the country do not now maintain some sort of a training school for officers before they are taken into the service, some legislation along that line might well be enacted.

Mr. THATCHER. If the gentleman will permit, in the city of Louisville we have had a training school for policemen for years. They go into training in this school after they are appointed. At first they are assigned to the simpler duties, but the course of instruction lasts for many months, and they get certificates when they have completed the course. We have found that to be very beneficial.

Mr. ROMJUE. That is before they go into the service?

Mr. THATCHER. No; they take this training after they have qualified, but they are assigned to simpler duties at the beginning; they go through the school and then their scope of duty is enlarged.

Mr. ROMJUE. It seems to me we would get better law enforcement in this country if we had police officers who are primarily capable, but, of course, if you pick up anybody who comes along you can not expect anything else except that the men will fall down in the enforcement of the law.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Probably the thought I have in mind should be addressed to the legislative committee, yet perhaps your committee has considered it. I do not know a city in the United States, either larger or smaller than Washington, where pedestrians are permitted to walk into red lights at street crossings as they do here. That may be a matter of regulation on the part of the commissioners. I am not assuming that I can run the other fellow's job better than he can himself, and I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that the police force here is not so bad as sometimes pictured. Like the police forces in other cities of the country, there may be exceptions. I have found nothing wrong with the police force of Washington. I have thought it was above the average. I think, for the sake of the pedestrian himself, for his own safety as well as for the convenience of traffic, there ought to be some regulation to stop a pedestrian from walking into red lights when crossing the streets. I wondered if the committee had considered that subject, and I would like to have the gentleman's opinion as to whether or not some suggestion should not be made to the proper authorities to make regulations in so far as that problem is concerned.

Mr. HOLADAY. I do not know that that question has been considered. That is a matter that would properly come under the regulations adopted by the traffic department, but I suppose the legislative committee, of course, would have authority, if

they thought it advisable, to write such a regulation into the law.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I should think it is a matter of mere traffic regulation, which the Commissioners of the District would have the authority to make.

Mr. HOLADAY. They would.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion in answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Kentucky in regard to the training of policemen?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. Nearly all of the police forces of the larger cities maintain training schools of their own, and intensive training is required before a man is permitted to serve on the force. The present tendency is to require a higher educational standard. Many of our colleges are introducing courses for the training of policemen, like the University of Chicago, with one of the best crime experts of the country at its head.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman's remarks are so interesting and so illuminating that I thought probably he would give us a little more information. I have called this to the attention of the members of your committee before. In going down Pennsylvania Avenue half the time we have no traffic officers and half the time we have, or probably one-third of the time, and I understand those officers are employed by the street railway company. Is that the situation, and what has been done about that, if anything? Can the gentleman give us any light on that subject?

Mr. HOLADAY. The personnel of the police force as carried in this bill will be 1,280, I believe. In addition to that, there are about 55 men who are paid by the street-railway system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLADAY. These men act as policemen and for all practical purposes, as far as a stranger going down the street is concerned, they are policemen. It is my desire, and I believe the desire of the committee, to make of the Washington police force a force that will be equal to any police force in our country. Washington ranks second with reference to the number of policemen to population; it ranks second as to the number of police to square miles of area and seventh as to salaries paid members of the police force. I may say that if the new salary bill which has been reported out from the committee is passed then the Washington police force will be paid at a higher rate than in any other city of comparable size.

The third reason for the unsatisfactory condition is the lack of scientifically trained personnel and adequate equipment. With reference to that, gentlemen, I want to point out what is carried in this bill. We have a very efficient fingerprint division, headed by Sandberg. He has been with that department for a great many years, and I believe he is generally recognized throughout the United States as one of the leading fingerprint men. Mr. Sandberg is rapidly approaching the time when, on account of age and infirmities, he will retire from the service. If he should retire to-day a competent photographer could not be found in his department. We are providing funds for an expert and well-trained photographer. We are providing funds for a microscopic chemist in order that thorough examinations may be made, and we are providing funds to an amount equal to \$2,000 or \$3,000 for the purchase of the necessary scientific equipment. Here is where those things may become important. They are not used every day, but two or three months ago in the case of a murder in this city the police desired to have a report as to whether or not certain spots on a garment belonging to the accused were human blood or another kind of blood.

They were compelled to wait two or three weeks to get that report. In this particular case, perhaps, it caused no damage, but in an ordinary case it is necessary that they have that report promptly. So we have provided funds for the necessary equipment and the necessary personnel to build up and strengthen the bureau of identification. There is one other division in that department for which we have not carried any funds because we did not have definite recommendations. The chief of police has been requested to consider that and, perhaps, in the following year some additional facilities can be provided. I have reference to a handwriting expert. It has been our purpose in a sane and sensible way to undertake this policy of building up and strengthening the bureau of identification.

Then we come to the fourth objection, and that is the delay of local courts in the trial of criminal cases.

Mr. GIBSON. Before the gentleman takes up his next subject may I ask him whether he has made any investigation or inquiry concerning the house of detention?

Mr. HOLADAY. I will say to the gentleman I have made such an investigation and, according to the rating which I mentioned in the earlier part of my remarks, I think I would accord to the house of detention the lowest position of all the departments of the city government.

The house of detention is, in reality, the police precinct where the female prisoners are taken. It corresponds in its general work with the other police precincts of the city. At the detention precinct they received on the average 7 prisoners a day—2 white and 5 colored. The average count in the detention precinct is 15 persons a day, and when I say it is the most inefficient unit, although it is a minor unit, I base my statement on the fact that to take care of these 15 prisoners they have in this detention precinct, in addition to the superintendent, 22 civilian employees.

Now, what does this mean? Let me put this proposition to the Members. Perhaps there is not a Member from a country district who can not recall one of his smaller counties where the sheriff has charge of a jail that has an average of 12 or 15 prisoners. How many people does he have to help him operate the jail? Call to mind some of your local counties with an average jail population of 15. I was at a jail back in my district only a few weeks ago where they have about 100 prisoners on the average. In addition to the sheriff there were 2 men and 1 woman operating this institution with 100 prisoners as the average and, gentlemen, some of the prisoners that have been in this jail within the past two or three years are as desperate characters as have been housed in any jail in the United States, and if I mentioned their names the Members would immediately be familiar with their reputations. But here, with an average population of 15, most of them picked up for misdemeanors, in addition to the superintendent they have 22 civil employees and then 2 regular policemen are detailed to go over there and assist.

I have here a list of the 22 employees, and I want you gentlemen to see what wonderful service these 15 prisoners are getting. There are 2 telephone clerks, there is an assistant clerk at \$1,860 a year, there is a junior clerk at \$1,500 a year, there is an underclerk at \$1,380 a year, there is an underclerk-typist at \$1,320 a year, there is an attendant at \$1,380 a year, there are 6 matrons at from \$1,200 to \$1,440 a year, there are 4 guards at \$1,200 a year, 2 drivers at \$1,440 a year, a cook, a laundress, and the list winds up with Moses Johnson, the janitor. So, these 15 prisoners should at least get good service.

There is another thing, gentlemen, in reference to the supplies for the institution. I did not intend to mention this, but I will mention it now that the question has been asked.

We must remember that inefficiency sometimes does more than mere dollars and cents damage. Since the close of this hearing, reports came to the committee that at a certain police precinct in the city a great quantity of supplies was stored and that these supplies were being carried away by the police. It was noised around through the community that the police were guilty of something that could not be justified, that through some underhand scheme they had secured a lot of supplies and were taking them away for their private use. We commenced an investigation, and what did we find? We found that the house of detention had foodstuffs stored there that had been there since June, 1928.

The very fact of inefficiency in having ordered more foodstuffs than were needed and storing them there was the cause of this report being spread throughout this police precinct that something was wrong when, as a matter of fact, there was not anything wrong with the precinct.

I have here a list of all these things that were in stock. I am not going to read this list, but remember that this stock was placed there in June, 1928. I have here the requisitions for the supplies for the detention precinct dated January 25, 1929, for supplies for the months of April, May, and June, 1929.

I find here a requisition for four dozen cans of gelatin, when at the same time they had, and they have to-day, stored at this precinct 200 pounds of gelatin that has been there almost two years. They requisitioned 200 pounds of beans and they have 250 pounds that have been there for two years. They requisitioned 20 pounds of mincemeat with 47 pounds out there since June, 1928, and further down in the list we find some sardines, 578 cans of sardines stored at this precinct, and their explanation of that is that formerly a woman had been employed in the House of Detention who was very fond of sardines, but she had quit the service and nobody else there cared for them. [Laughter.]

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield.

Mr. GLOVER. I know we can not believe everything we read in the papers here, but I saw in the papers a day or two ago that school girls in this city could buy gin and other drinks of that kind in this city. I wish the gentleman would tell us whether that statement is true or not.

Mr. HOLADAY. I do not have definite information with reference to that statement, but I will say that, in my opinion, it is not true. The logic of the situation appeals to me as rendering such a situation improbable and, I might say, impossible. I have no definite information in reference to that, and all I can say is that, in my opinion, the reports in the newspaper are not true.

Mr. GLOVER. Does not the gentleman believe that in justice to the city when such statements are given out to the public, as they have been in the last day or two in the papers, that the civic authorities should investigate that and, if not true, ask the paper publishing the statement to kindly retract such statement, which is prejudicial to the citizenship of Washington?

Mr. HOLADAY. Of course, we come back to this proposition—the newspaper answers that we did not publish that as a fact, we simply published what was reported as a matter of news. It seems that that was reported by a man who was testifying before one of the committees of the House.

But, gentlemen, let me say with reference to the organization of all precincts, the organization of the bureau of identification, and throughout the entire system the responsibility must be with the commissioner of police.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. HOLADAY. The President has nominated a new commissioner of police, General Crosby. I have confidence in General Crosby's ability and his desire to provide for the city the best police force that is possible. I think that we ought not to ask General Crosby to make an immediate shakeup. After he has had time to make a careful study and investigation, I believe that he will do what he believes is best. I think Congress will ever be willing to support General Crosby, or any other commissioner, in giving the city of Washington a first-class police department.

There is one other reason for the unsatisfactory condition, entirely beyond the control of the police, and that is the fact that it is impossible here in our District courts to get an immediate or early hearing of a criminal case.

We all know that the effort of every lawyer defending a criminal is to get delay, because a criminal case from the standpoint of the public prosecutor is a good deal like a pancake, it must be served hot. [Laughter.] If a man is arrested and gives bond and it is a year or two years before his case comes to trial and then his attorney can get a continuance of a few months, his successful prosecution is rendered very difficult.

The condition that exists in reference to the trial of criminal cases is, in my opinion, largely due to the lack of effort on the part of the judges of our courts. We have a municipal court with five judges, who are holding court on an average two hours and six minutes a day for a 5-day week. We have a police court with four judges, holding court on an average 3 hours and 24 minutes for a 6-day week. I should say with reference to the municipal court that they are current with their docket and are asking that their jurisdiction be extended and enlarged.

We have a supreme court with seven judges, who are holding court on an average 2 hours 53½ minutes for a 5-day week and taking three months vacation each year, with their criminal docket more than a year behind.

The responsibility for that condition, gentlemen, rests with the courts, and we can not change that condition. The change in the condition must come about by a new conception of public duty on the part of our judges and a conception of public duty that more nearly approaches the conception of the public duty held by the late Chief Justice Taft. [Applause.]

Mr. GIBSON. May I suggest that in the equity division for civil cases the court is about two years behind?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Are not the Federal courts all over the country behind?

Mr. HOLADAY. No; I would not say everywhere, but I think generally they are.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. We have had reports from the Wickersham Commission indicating that the dockets are clogged up almost universally.

Mr. HOLADAY. I am sorry to see the tendency, I think throughout the United States, for judges of the court to hold court shorter hours and shorter hours and fewer days and fewer days and take longer vacations and longer vacations with each succeeding year.

Gentlemen, in conclusion let me say that it is the purpose of the committee—and I believe the purpose of the Congress—to do everything that is possible to improve the condition of the

Washington police force. We have directed our efforts along that line, and I believe that the provisions that are made in this bill will, in connection with the new incoming commissioner in charge of police, give to the city of Washington a better police force in the years to come than it has had in the years that have gone. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to myself for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein, as a part of them, a statement of the National Grange on farm legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield such time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] as he may require.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I know the committee is anxious to reach the consideration of the bill in detail, and, therefore, I shall detain it for only a few minutes. I do not intend to discuss the many subjects which have been discussed by my friends who have just preceded me, but shall advert to only one particular subject.

Since I entered the House more than 10 years ago, there has been almost constant agitation of the question as to how the cost of conducting the government of the District of Columbia should be divided—what part should be paid from the Federal revenue and what part from the District revenue. At that time a 50-50 ratio basis was in effect. Later the ratio basis was modified so as to impose 60 per cent on the District and 40 per cent on the Treasury. Still later, some five or six years ago, when the District appropriation bill was under consideration, the Holman rule being invoked, the ratio basis was abandoned and the annual contribution of the Federal Government fixed at \$9,000,000, and that figure is still used, with the result that at this time the Federal contribution is said to be less than 25 per cent of the total. Nine million is the amount carried in the present bill.

Those who opposed the ratio plan argued among other things that it was illogical and wholly unwarranted in view of the fact that conditions vary from time to time, so that in some year a heavier liability and expense are cast on the District government because of the value and care of the property belonging to the Federal Government than in some other year. Accordingly they contended that any inflexible ratio plan is incapable of being defended. On the other hand, it was contended that the ratio plan had long received the approval of Congress and that it has the effect of insuring stability and relieving the situation of uncertainty.

I do not see how those who oppose that plan as too rigid and as possibly some times imposing on the Federal Treasury a greater liability than it should bear, can deny that their argument applies with the same force to the lump-sum appropriation method. A contribution of \$9,000,000 is arbitrary. A few years ago it might have been more or it might have been less than the Federal Government should pay. To-day there are many who assert that the amount is too small, and, perhaps, there are some in the House who assert that it is too large. There is thus a controversy which can not be appreciably quieted so long as the view of any one Member of the House or Senate, however able and well informed, or the view of any small subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, however able and well informed is to be accepted as final.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Is it not a fact that when the \$9,000,000 contribution was first put into effect it was given quite lengthy discussion and attention on the floor of the House, and did not the House adopt the recommendation almost unanimously?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the committee brought in the \$9,000,000 appropriation. The point of order was made against it and there was considerable discussion upon the point of order. The point of order was overruled, because the Holman rule was held by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to control. Then there came a vote in a very small Committee of the Whole, and the \$9,000,000 was retained in the bill, and the sum of \$9,000,000, which, as I have just stated is an arbitrary sum, has been continued ever since.

The character and processes of the government of the District are determined exclusively by Congress, in which the people of the District are unrepresented, and it must be admitted that it is the duty of Congress to make the government as satisfactory as possible and to remove if it can any ground for continual doubt and agitation in respect to a matter of major importance. In order to proceed in that direction I entertain the opinion, which I have long held, that Congress should have the benefit of the opinion and advice of some agency constituted and equipped to investigate all of the facts and periodically recom-

mend to Congress at limited intervals what the division of expense in fairness and justice should be. My belief is that there is no other way of properly meeting the attack upon the present policy which is hardly more than a year by year conjecture as to the proportion to be paid out of the Federal Treasury and the proportion to be paid out of the District revenue—an extraordinary guesswork kind of legislation. It seems to me that there is no other method of tranquilizing a situation which is marked by a great deal of confusion.

I am to-day introducing a bill to which I invite the serious attention of the District Committee. It provides for the creation of a permanent commission to be composed of the chairmen of the House and Senate District Committees and Committees on Appropriations, a Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and three residents of the District appointed by the President. It contemplates that the commission shall from time to time make a thorough investigation, and every four years, beginning in December, 1931, when the Seventy-second Congress will meet in regular session, report its recommendation to Congress touching the division of expenditures. It is also authorized to make other recommendations to Congress relative to legislation and administration pertaining to the local government. The work of the commission would not involve any large cost, which is to be shared equally by the Federal and the District Governments, and it is at least conceivable that it would make for coherence and improvement in the existing status. It would surely, it seems to me, assist Congress in discharging its inescapable obligation to maintain governmental conditions in the District deserving general approval and at least not furnishing ground for well-merited dissatisfaction and complaint. [Applause.] I ask unanimous consent to append to my remarks the bill which I have introduced.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the permanent commission hereinafter authorized to be appointed is directed, as soon as possible and from time to time thereafter, to inquire into the fiscal relations of the United States and the District of Columbia, with a view to ascertaining and recommending to Congress the amount of the annual contribution by the Government of the United States toward the expenses of the District of Columbia. It shall make a thorough investigation of all the conditions and circumstances which should be considered in determining what in justice and fairness should be the division of the appropriations between the Government and the District. It shall report its initial recommendation to Congress in December, 1931, and make a subsequent report every four years thereafter.

Sec. 2. That the officers and employees of all administrative agencies of the government of the District of Columbia shall furnish to the commission such information regarding powers, duties, activities, organization, and methods of business as the commission may require; and the commission, or any of its employees when duly authorized by the commission, shall have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any such agency for the purpose of securing the information needed by the commission in the prosecution of its work.

Sec. 3. That the commission shall engage and use the services of such experts and clerks as it may need in performing its duties, without being subject to the requirements of any existing law in selecting them, and shall fix the compensation they are to receive. And to this end, and to cover all expenses of every character incident to the performance of its duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, the same to be paid in equal proportions by the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia, and to be expended by the commission under such regulations as it may prescribe, and every report to the Congress shall include an itemized statement of expenditures up to the date thereof.

Sec. 4. That the said commission shall be composed of the chairmen of the Committees on the District of Columbia of the House and Senate, the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, one of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia designated by the Board of Commissioners, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and three actual residents of the District of Columbia of capacity and experience, who are willing to serve without compensation, who shall be appointed by the President. Whenever any committee chairman is unable for any reason to act he shall designate a member of his committee to act in his stead for such time as he may think proper, and notwithstanding the expiration of any Congress the chairmen of the said committees in any such Congress, or the members designated by the chairmen to act, shall continue to serve until new committees are created by the subsequent Congress. Whenever the Commissioner of the District of Columbia who has been designated to act is unable to do so, the board shall designate another commissioner to act in his stead for such time as it may think proper, and whenever the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may be unable to act he shall

designate one of his subordinates to act in his stead for such time as he may think proper. Each of the persons appointed by the President and the successor of such person shall continue to serve until, because of death or disability, or for any reason appearing to the President, another person is appointed who shall have the same qualifications as the original appointee.

SEC. 5. That the said commission is authorized, in its discretion, at any time to make other recommendations to Congress relative to legislation and administration pertaining to the government of the District of Columbia as it may think desirable.

SEC. 6. That the said commission is authorized to conduct its work while Congress is in session or during any recess thereof.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time, and I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Farmers' produce market: For the acquisition of a site in squares Nos. 354 and 355, including all necessary expenses for the clearing and leveling of the ground, the erection of protection sheds and suitable stands and stalls, and the installation of sanitary conveniences and heating and telephone service, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act authorizing acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1487), \$300,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UNDERHILL: Page 7, beginning in line 6, strike out the paragraph ending in line 15.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, as most of you know, I have served as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia for the past 10 years. I have sacrificed a great deal in order that I might do what I considered my duty toward the Nation's Capital and the District of Columbia. Although I have fathered some constructive legislation, yet most of my constructive successes have been in the nature of destruction. In other words, I have endeavored to protect the District from unfriendly, unwise proposals from without and from foolishness and folly from within, and so have been more active in opposing proposed legislation than I have been in supporting legislation for the District. The purpose of the amendment which I have just offered is of that character of constructive legislation through destruction in an effort to eliminate this unnecessary, unjust, wasteful, useless, extravagant expenditure of \$300,000 for a utility which is of no value to the residents of the District and of little or no value to those outside of the District. Such a proposal may have been quite an adjunct to the District at one time, but that time has passed. New developments within and without the District make this appropriation absolutely and entirely unnecessary. I hope that the usual sympathy of the House for the farmer will not influence Members in their action on this amendment. As I understand it, practically 80 per cent of the farmers who do business in the District are opposed to this legislation; 90 per cent of the merchants are opposed to it, and, as far as I can learn, 100 per cent of the people are opposed to it.

Furthermore, the act which we passed in the Seventieth Congress was for the purchase by condemnation or otherwise of the whole of squares No. 354 and 355, as shown on the books of the surveyor of the District of Columbia. This provides for a farmers' produce market, for the acquisition of a site in squares No. 354 and 355. I am familiar with this legislation, as the matter first came before the District of Columbia Committee two years ago. At that time I was quite convinced that it was unnecessary but did not like to take a decided stand on the subject. However, the fight came upon the location, and I was registered in the committee in favor of the southwest site. With me it is not a question to-day of location, where it shall be put, but it is a question of elimination.

Mr. STALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I want first to finish my statement. The bill provides \$300,000 for this purpose, and \$225,000 is for the acquisition of land, a site in these two squares. The price at which this can be secured is, as usual, far, far above the assessed valuation. I will leave it to others to tell you of the objections to this particular site. But I will propose, if the chairman of the subcommittee will be gracious enough to do so—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. STALKER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I simply want to say that on Sunday a week ago I was driving out Florida Avenue NE. and saw some buildings under construction. I stopped and went in and looked over the buildings. I saw 50 of the finest stores that could possibly be erected to house commission houses being constructed and 75 per cent completed.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. In a minute. I made inquiry, and found that 40 of the stores were being built by individual merchants who were paying for the stores themselves, had bought the ground, and the others were being built by contractors to sell to the merchants of the District of Columbia.

Now, when the merchants of the District of Columbia are willing to build their own markets, and, further, have set aside a large tract of ground for the farmers' market, it seems to me, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] says, it is an absolute waste of funds to vote this appropriation.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I wanted to propound a question to the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, and that question was this: In view of his observation that the business men of Washington had solved this problem—and I agree with him—and in view of the fact that a market like the Western Market, a large center market, has vacant stalls at the present time, and in view of the fact that the commission merchants and the farmers themselves have combined and purchased a large tract of land over at Fort Meigs, where they are going to have extended operations and buildings, how could he subscribe to a favorable report for the expenditure of \$300,000, which would be a duplication of that which is already under contemplation and under process of construction by private individuals?

Mr. SIMMONS. Personally, I do not subscribe to it. I think this proposed \$300,000 is an unjustified expenditure, and, in any event, it is more than is necessary. However, the Committee on Appropriations overruled me on that opinion. The committee favored this appropriation. Personally, I am opposed to it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The hearings disclose the commissioners favor postponing this appropriation. It should be held in abeyance until you learn just how far the commission men are going. The largest dealers in Washington have already purchased ground and are building in the northeast section. No matter what action is taken here to-day, you are not going to get these merchants to move to the southwest. They certainly should know what is best for their business. If they decide, as they have, that southwest is not a suitable location, that certainly should be evidence enough for Members of the House. Everyone knows the long fight that has been waged to force the commission men to go southwest. They have rebelled, however, and at their own expense are constructing their own market. It is not fair to spend their money for a market they will not use.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. STALKER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the objection, I will not confine my remarks to the statement that I had prepared.

I want to say to the membership of this House that I represent a district that furnishes 65 per cent of the farmers who bring their farm produce to the farmers' market, and with my colleague from Maryland [Mr. ZIEHLMAN] represent 85 per cent of the farmers who bring their produce to the farmers' market.

This bill for the acquisition of a site in southwest Washington for a farmers' market is the most indefensible piece of legislation that has been passed by this House since I have been a Member.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GAMBRILL. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. Will your farmers go down to southwest Washington?

Mr. GAMBRILL. They certainly will not. The Maryland and Virginia farmers met in the city of Washington on January 15, 1930, and voted almost unanimously—only two persons opposing—to accept the offer of the Union Market Terminal Co., that has acquired the Patterson tract, of which they have purchased 40 acres, and on which they are erecting at the present time commission buildings in order to accommodate 42 commission merchants. Those men have expended \$750,000, or will have spent that much in the next few months, and the farmers want to go there, so that there is no need for your establishing a market in southwest Washington.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBRILL. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Was not this matter gone over carefully a year or two ago, and is it not a question like this, whether the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad shall haul produce into this District and five other railroads coming into the District shall bring green stuff from the South?

Mr. GAMBRILL. The question of water or rail transportation does not enter into this proposition to the slightest degree.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBRILL. In a moment.

Ninety-nine per cent of the vegetables and fruits and produce that go to the farmers' market is hauled there by the farmers themselves, and does not come by rail transportation, water, or otherwise, except as hauled by the farmers themselves.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The bill says this is a farmers' market. It says nothing about its being an adjunct of the Pennsylvania Railroad or the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad or five other railroads. I think Congress is going a long way afield in appropriating \$300,000 for any or all of the railroads.

Mr. GAMBRILL. The farmers' produce market is intended as a place where the farmers can bring their produce, display, and sell it. There will be no facilities at this farmers' market for storage. All the goods consigned to Washington by rail or water go to the commission merchants and jobbers in wholesale lots and is distributed by them, so that there should not enter into the discussion any question of rail transportation.

Some time ago Congress pronounced the doom of the old Center Market, and this market must be vacated by July 1, 1930, to make way for the public buildings south of Pennsylvania Avenue. I take it to be a proper function of a municipality to provide convenient market places where the food supply necessary for the people may be readily had and distributed. This municipal duty has been recognized and acted on by every city of any considerable size with which I am familiar.

Owing to the dual relation here in Washington between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, this duty may be a joint one and possibly there may be some who hold to the belief that the furnishing of these facilities should be left to private enterprise. Regardless of how this question is determined, it can hardly be doubted that in some way or in some manner a center market will be found which will be the main distributing point of the food supply of the city. Likewise, it will hardly be denied that for the convenience of the householders and the public generally this center market should be the location also of the commission produce merchants and the farmers who bring their truck to the city. Centralization rather than decentralization is desirable and, indeed, necessary.

I can hardly believe that the center market will be located in southwest Washington, for to do so would place the market back of all the whole line of public buildings now being constructed, those which are planned to be constructed, and in a section far removed from the center of population.

If it be admitted that, as a result of legislation or the initiative of private enterprise, there will be developed in the course of time a center market place in Washington, and if it be conceded this center market is not to be located south of Pennsylvania Avenue, then it is a waste of money to provide for a farmers' market south of Pennsylvania Avenue with a center market in some other place north thereof.

The three market activities—the retail market, the commission produce merchants, and the truckers who come to the farmers' market—form units which ought not be separated if the convenience of the public is to be recognized.

To my mind, one of the most indefensible pieces of legislation that has been passed by Congress since I have been a Member was the passage of H. R. 8298, for the acquisition of a site for a farmers' market in southwest Washington on squares bounded by Tenth, Eleventh, E, and G Streets.

I have no criticism to offer to the action of the Committee on Appropriations in reporting an item of \$300,000 to carry out the legislative intent and purpose of the bill, H. R. 8298, for this, I take it, was its duty. However, this does not preclude the House from rejecting the asked-for appropriation if it is indefensible, unwise, and wholly useless.

It is not my purpose to go into the merits or, rather, the demerits of this legislation, for which an appropriation is now being asked, as the subject was discussed in the first session of the Seventieth Congress when the legislation came up for consideration.

It might be said, parenthetically, however, that the location of this farmers' market in southwest Washington will place it $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the center of population, access to which can only be had from the north, northwest, and northeast by crossing Pennsylvania Avenue; that four-fifths of the population of Washington is to be found north of Pennsylvania Avenue; that the whole of the territory south of Pennsylvania Avenue, from the Capitol to the White House and down to the Mall, will be given over to public buildings and parks; that the proposal is to construct a farmers' produce market in a section cut off from the rest of Washington, in a section that can not expand because of topographical limitation and terrain.

But aside from these facts, but briefly summarized, you contemplate building a farmers' produce market in a section where the farmers will not go, for the very obvious reason that they will find no customers. And by your own lack of foresight, which has been shown, you will drive the truckers out of business and place the food control of this city more and more in the hands of the chain stores.

Some might argue that the city has established a fish market in southwest Washington, and for this reason the farmers' market should be there; but the fish market has no retail trade, and it is the retail trade between the farmers and the householders which should be encouraged. When Maj. Carey H. Brown was here in Washington with the City Park and Planning Commission he made a survey of this market situation, and here is what he had to say regarding the fish market:

The experience of the fish market is this, as I am informed: It was contemplated by the municipal government at the time the fish market was located that there would be a very large retail business in fish and sea food that would come down to that market. That has not been borne out by experience. People do not go down there to buy fish and sea food, because it is too far, too inconvenient.

The irony of the situation is that the legislation on which this proposed appropriation is based calls for the acquisition of land and the erection of sheds "for the purpose of a wholesale farmers' market." What is needed is not a wholesale farmers' market but a retail market, so that the farmers and truckers may sell direct to the consumers.

A year or two ago most of the truckers who hauled their produce to Washington were provided for at a farmers' market somewhere to the west of the Center Market. Then over \$3,000,000 worth of produce was sold yearly from this farmers' market, of which over 30 per cent, or about \$1,000,000, was retail trade.

But will the truckers haul their produce to the southwest site where customers are not to be found and where there is no natural center of trade? Of course not. And you will have a farmers' market as barren as the Sahara Desert. Of all the truckers who bring their produce to the Washington markets 85 per cent come from the districts represented by Congressman ZIEHLMAN and me, and it is safe to say 65 per cent of all such truckers come from my district.

I know what the truckers are going to do. Some are going out of business thoroughly discouraged by the lack of foresight shown by Congress in trying to corral them in a remote section of Washington, in a cul-de-sac where there is no business to be found; some will seek other markets, the Eastern and the Western; some will huckster their produce; but hardly one will go to southwest Washington; and all are resolved not to place themselves in the hands of the Terminal Refrigerating & Warehousing Co., who are the principal backers and prospective beneficiaries of this indefensible legislation.

That company's first objective was to have legislation passed providing for a farmers' market in southwest Washington alongside of their refrigeration plant, and by doing this they thought they would catch the commission produce merchants in their spider's web and compel these merchants to go to southwest Washington.

The terminal company thought the commission produce merchants would be bound to follow the farmer and that the farmers would be forced to this site in southwest Washington.

But what is the situation? Bear in mind that when the farmers' market was located on B and Little B Streets, between Tenth and Twelfth Streets NW.—property now taken over for use by Commerce Department Building—the commission houses were in the immediate vicinity on B Street, Louisiana Avenue, and C Street, between Ninth and Tenth; also on Ninth and Tenth Streets, between B and C Streets NW.

The scheme of the terminal company was to locate the farmers' market next door to them in the southwest site, the idea being that the commission men would be attracted there, and, this accomplished, they felt that through their storage facilities they would have a control over the food supply of the city. Now, as a matter of fact, the commission merchants are first and foremost business men, and it was an idle thought that prompted the belief that these business men would go to a portion of the city far removed from the center of population.

Acting in furtherance of their best interest, these commission merchants purchased 40 acres of land of the Patterson tract in the northeast, and buildings are now being erected there to accommodate 42 commission houses and jobbers who control 80 per cent of the fruit and vegetable wholesale commission business of Washington. And a portion of the land so acquired in the Patterson tract has been laid aside for occupancy by the farmers who wish to come there to sell their produce. Inasmuch as you have the commission produce merchants controlling 80 per cent of the fruit and vegetable wholesale commission business planning to go to the Patterson tract, and inasmuch as there has been no provision made as yet for the location of a center market to take the place of the one to be abandoned on July 1, 1930, would it not be the part of wisdom to defer making any appropriation for a farmers' market as called for by this bill under consideration until it can be determined if all the activities can not be centralized rather than be scattered to the four winds of the city? And there are other reasons why this appropriation should not be made at this time.

On January 6, 1930, Senator CAPPER introduced Senate bill 3090, authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, suitable land within the District of Columbia for this purpose of a public market, devoted to the sale of food, including products of the farm, the land to be acquired for this purpose to be selected by the joint actions of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital.

This bill of Senator CAPPER further provides that "on not less than 200,000 square feet of the land the commissioners shall cause to be constructed such shelters and other improvements and facilities as they deem necessary for use by farmers for the sale of products of the farm."

On Saturday, March 8, 1930, a hearing was held on this bill by the Senate District Committee when housewives, farmers, storekeepers, and citizen leaders packed the committee room advocating a favorable report on the bill. It has the indorsement of the Federation of Citizens' Association, and the demand for a center market with a farmers' market as an essential and necessary adjunct thereto seems to be universal in Washington. A similar bill, H. R. 8561, was introduced in the House by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BOWMAN], and has been referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. "Would it not be the part of wisdom and good sense to defer action on appropriating \$300,000 for a farmers' market in southwest Washington until action has been taken on these bills for the establishment of a center market?"

Furthermore, there is a bill, H. R. 6120, known as the Elliott bill, which passed the House on December 16, 1929, and has been reported with amendments by the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, providing for the further acquisition for use of the United States of lands south of Pennsylvania Avenue so as to embrace all of the territory bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue and New York Avenue on the north, Virginia Avenue and Maryland Avenue projected in a straight line to Twining Lake on the south, and Delaware Avenue SW. on the east.

Of course, the acquisition of this further land for public buildings and parks will place the southwest site for a farmers' market back of all the fine buildings to be erected for the various activities of the Government. A more illogical, unsuitable, and improper place for a farmers' market, or any other market activity, could hardly be found in the whole of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended one minute so that I may ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANKFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I am much interested in what the gentleman is saying. This has been before the committees of Congress for several years, possibly three times before the House and three times before the Senate committee. The District commissioners have approved it, as well as the Committee on Appropriations. Can the gentleman distinguish between the

view of the District commissioners and the Appropriations Committee and the views of the farmers?

Mr. GAMBRILL. I can not distinguish between those views. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia ask that the matter be deferred for two or three years until it may be determined where the new center market should be located, it being the desire of everyone that the marketing activities be centralized rather than decentralized.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from GEORGIA [Mr. HART] is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the bill authorizing this appropriation, as most of you will remember, was gone into quite thoroughly and in great detail last year. I want to disagree to some extent with one of the statements already made, to the effect that 99 per cent of the fruits and vegetables that come from the farm and consumed in Washington are delivered here by neighboring farmers.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. COYLE. The statement of your colleague from Maryland was that 99 per cent of the produce brought to the farmers' market came in the farmers' own conveyances; not 99 per cent of what was consumed here.

Mr. HARE. That may be true, but the point I wish to make is that according to evidence produced last year, 70 per cent or more of the fruits and vegetables consumed in the city of Washington were fruits and vegetables shipped here from various States not contiguous to the city of Washington or neighboring territory.

It was further testified, if I recall correctly, that possibly 60 per cent of the fruits and vegetables consumed in the city of Washington are first sent to Potomac Yards by freight or by express and from there assigned to commission merchants in Washington.

I went into this quite thoroughly last year and I was impressed with the southwest market, for this reason: If 70 per cent or more of the fruits and vegetables consumed in this city are shipped from other States, such as Louisiana, Texas, West Virginia, Arkansas, Georgia, South Carolina, and other States and go through the Potomac Yards, the question naturally arises as to which location in the city will be most convenient for the delivery of these products in Washington from the yards referred to.

To illustrate, if I ship a carload of cantaloupes to Potomac Yard, and they arrive there this evening or to-night and I see from the report of the market news service of the Department of Agriculture that in the city of Washington the supply of cantaloupes is limited I will wire direct to Potomac Yard that this carload be consigned and directed to a commission merchant in the city of Washington. Now, if the wholesale market is located at the southwest market, as already provided, just 1 mile from Potomac Yard, that carload of cantaloupes can be moved there within 30 minutes and placed on the market tomorrow morning for sale at the rising of the sun. On the other hand, if the market is located at the place designated here as the Patterson or Eckington tract, that carload of cantaloupes would have to be placed on another railroad track, carried over two separate and distinct railroad lines, a distance of 21 miles before it could reach the Patterson tract or the Eckington location, and it would not arrive at either place before noon the following day, which would mean a 24-hour delay in getting this car of cantaloupes on the market. You can readily see how such an arrangement would operate to the disadvantage of both the shipper and the consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as other gentlemen have not been allowed that privilege, while I have no interest in the matter one way or the other, except that all should be treated alike, I object.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALL] is recognized.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I rise in opposition to the amendment because I have had an opportunity to see the development of this particular piece of legislation from its inception. Being on the subcommittee of the legislative branch of the Committee on the Dis-

trict of Columbia, I attended all the hearings and I went into the matter very thoroughly.

Two years ago this proposition was threshed out in committee and threshed out on the floor of the House, and the Senate went into the matter very carefully. The stamp of approval has been placed upon this proposed legislation all down the line—the authorization of \$300,000 for the purchase of the two squares, and before the legislation came to the committee it had the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOLADAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. No; not at this time.

Mr. HOLADAY. I think the gentleman is making a misstatement. I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. No; that was the report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as it came to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and it is included in the report that was given to the House when this bill was placed under consideration.

Mr. HOLADAY. Let me say to the gentleman that at the hearings before our committee a few weeks ago the commissioners reported they were against it at the present time.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Then may I say in answer to that statement that in reading the hearings before the appropriating committee I found that when the gentleman from Illinois asked Commissioner Taliaferro exactly the same question he said that if he had an opportunity and was asked to make the same report he would do the same as he did two years ago, and when asked, I believe by the gentleman from Kentucky, if the conditions of the market situation had changed over the past two years he said he could see no particular change in the situation.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I think the gentleman has the location confused.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. No; I understand the location.

Mr. HOLADAY. Will the gentleman give the report of the other two commissioners?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia in their report indorsed two locations. One was the northeast location, known as the Eckington site, and the other was the southwest location, down by the fish market, and they said if they were called upon to make a report as to which they preferred they would prefer the southwest location.

After listening to all the evidence and seeing the general movements that have come about over this 2-year period, there are these facts to be considered: First, the question of location. Then there comes the question of defeating the purpose of the legislation in reference to another site. Then there comes an amendment before the appropriating committee to destroy all legislation, and now we are face to face with an amendment to strike out the appropriation altogether. It seems to me the question of desirability of a farmers' market enters into the proposition, and all through our hearings there was shown the necessity for a farmers' market controlled by the farmers and under the control of the officers of the District of Columbia, to use as a safeguard against beating down prices and placing the farmers under the direct control of commission merchants. In doing this we are eliminating competition and making it impossible for the farmers to bring in their produce and sell it at their own prices instead of placing them directly under the influence of the commission merchants. Therefore it seems to me this appropriation should be kept in the bill and the commissioners be permitted to carry out the project, which has the stamp of approval of all the officers. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman, when the House was considering the legislative bill, under which this appropriation is sought to be made, I asked the author of the bill, Mr. STALKER, if it were contemplated that there should be any retail department in the market to be established in the southwest. His reply was "no"; that it was to be solely a wholesale proposition.

Now, the proposition as I see it is this: Whether at Government expense we are going to establish in Washington a wholesale marketing plant into which produce from distant points in the country may be shipped, and thereby take from the farmers and truck growers about Washington their Washington market, and establish a retail market for the people around Washington who are entitled to this place at which to market their produce? If we are, we should strike out this appropriation.

My view is that the people in and around Washington who have truck farms are entitled to have Washington for their market, to which place they can bring their produce and market it and sell directly to the consumers. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERHILL. But they have specifically stated they do not want it; the commission merchants who handle the produce

from the outside state they do not want it, and the citizens' associations are unanimously opposed to it.

Mr. BUSBY. I can not see any reason for our forcing it on them.

Mr. McSWAIN. Are not the farmers from other States, who can not come in here in wagons and in automobiles, entitled to some consideration in sending their produce here?

Mr. BUSBY. I do not yield any further.

Mr. McSWAIN. Are they not entitled to some consideration in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BUSBY. They are not entitled to have the Government establish a plant here to which they can ship their produce any more than are the people in St. Louis or Chicago or any other place, and the folks in South Carolina, in Georgia, and in all of the other States are in the same boat about that proposition.

Mr. McSWAIN. But for a generation have we not been furnishing a place for the farmers from Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, and are not the farmers from the outside entitled to the same consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want you to understand what this amendment is and what the proposition in this bill is. This proposition is not for a farmers' market. It ought to be dubbed another real-estate provision for Washington realtors and not for the farmers. [Applause.] Remember that when you are voting for this you are voting \$225,000 for Washington real-estate scalpers and \$75,000 for a place for a so-called farmers' market.

I have maintained a home in the city of Washington during my term in Congress, with the exception of one year, and I have had my family here. I have been an almost daily visitor to these markets for the purpose of making purchases, and I want to say to you that if you pass this bill with this item in it you are not doing it in the interest of the farmers and you are doing it against the interests of the consuming public, as my own personal experience in these markets show.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will carry. It is a real-estate proposition rather than a farmers' proposition.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL]. I am heartily in favor of the appropriation of \$300,000 for the establishment of a farmers' produce market in southwest Washington.

If such produce market is established in the southwest part of the city it will be in close proximity of Potomac Yard. Practically all of the produce from the southeast enters Washington and the north through Potomac Yard. My own State of Florida possibly ships through Potomac Yard on an average of \$100,000,000 worth of fruit and vegetables annually, and, of course, a large portion of this is carried on across the Potomac River and distributed here in the city of Washington. If the market is established in the southwest, as provided in the bill, then Florida products which reach Potomac Yard will have approximately 1 mile to travel to find the way into the Washington market, while on the other hand, if the farmers' produce market is established in northwest Washington, Florida produce will have to, in Potomac Yard, be transferred two or three times in reaching the northwest Washington market. It will also travel approximately 30 additional miles in reaching the market if placed in the northwest part of the city. This additional mileage will not only cause great expense to the shippers of my State, but would cause a delay of some 3 to 24 hours.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. Not now; I am sorry that I have not the time.

The fact is that my State sends more vegetables and fruits to the Washington market than any other State of the Union—

Mr. GAMBRILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. Other than possibly Maryland and Virginia.

I am sorry that I can not yield now to my friend from Maryland.

Therefore why should not my people have their produce placed on the Washington market as quickly and economically as possible rather than to delay possibly 24 hours for the transfer on different railroads, and in the meantime perhaps the market has declined. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] and others object to appropriating \$300,000, while several million dollars represent the annual gross receipts from produce sold in the Washington market. The expenditure by the Government is fully warranted.

Mr. GAMBRILL rose.

Mr. GREEN. I regret that the time is so limited that I can not yield.

In making this appropriation for the establishment of the farmers' produce market in Washington we should take into consideration the benefits to be derived from people from all parts of the country, as the taxpayers' money from all parts of the country will be used in payment for the buildings and grounds, and surely my State should have a voice in where the market will be established. Florida sends from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000 annually to the Federal Treasury. It also sends more fruit and vegetable produce to the Washington market than any other State in the Union with the possible exception of Maryland and Virginia; therefore I desire to register my protest of the northwest location and my approval of the southwest location.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that some two years ago the matter of authorizing this market in the southwest was well debated in the House, approved by the House, and sent to the other end of the Capitol. At the other end of the Capitol the same procedure was held, and the other body has given approval for the southwest site. Our own House Appropriations Committee has authorized and approved this \$300,000 item for the establishment of the market in the southwest, and I feel that it is nothing but keeping of good faith for us to vote favorably for the appropriation.

To vote against same would be breaking of the faith which we manifested some two years ago when we passed the bill for the establishment of the market in the southwest. As for me, I shall vote to uphold the obligations of and the integrity of the House of Representatives.

I am pleading for the fruit and vegetable growers of my State and of the entire country, who receive so little, but deserve so much. In voting to establish this market in southwest Washington you will aid them. It is a farm relief measure.

My friend from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is entirely correct. It is a matter of either protecting and aiding the men who are producing the vegetables and the fruits of our country or it is to assist the speculators to diminish the net receipts of the producers. For my part, I shall vote against the speculators and grafters and for the farmers and growers of my State who are braving the atmospheric elements and wringing, by the sweat of their brow, an honest living from Mother Earth. These men make nations strong. [Applause.]

May I again remind my colleagues that Florida is materially interested in the establishment of this market in the southwest. My State furnishes approximately 80 per cent of the nation's grapefruit; 60 per cent of the nation's eggplant; 42 per cent of the table cucumbers; 41 per cent of the snap beans; 66 per cent of the peppers; 30 per cent of the celery; 27 per cent of the tomatoes; 12 per cent of the early Irish potatoes; and a large percentage of the other vegetables and fruits, including an abundance of the best oranges and strawberries in the world. [Applause.] These figures are approximate, but statistics, I believe, will reveal that, in some cases, at least, even a greater percentage is furnished.

If the Washington farmers' produce market were placed in the northwest part of the city instead of the southwest, it would probably cost the fruit and vegetable growers of my State \$100,000 annually. My friends, they are interested; and a vote for the establishment of the market in the southwest is decidedly not only in their favor but in the interest of farm relief. Now, those of my colleagues who are really in favor of farm relief have an opportunity to show same by voting for the establishment of the market in the southwest. In fact, all States south of Potomac Yard are interested in this matter and will be benefited by this appropriation.

It is also my opinion that the consuming public in the city of Washington will be given their fruits and vegetables at a decidedly lower figure by such act. A great amount of waste, expense, and lost motion to the citizens of Washington and the growers of the Nation will be avoided by establishing of the market in the southwest, and I sincerely trust that the House will ratify its former authorization by now appropriating the money for the establishment. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have been endeavoring, as best I know how, to save money to the Treasury of the United States, but I am not in favor of the proposed amendment and I will tell you why.

I believe it would be an act of bad faith if we were to strike out the paragraph included in the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

This fight was fought and decided two years ago, and I do not suppose there was a more intense fight ever waged on this floor than the one that was precipitated at that time. The proposal that was in the bill as it came from the subcommittee was identical with the proposal that was submitted on this floor at that time for the purpose of beating this marketing measure.

At that time we adopted what is the language now in the bill as it appears before you, and in doing this we are carrying out the mandate of the Congress as then expressed.

Now, what has transpired since that time? I will agree with the gentleman who has already spoken here that this was a fight then, and it is a fight now, between the railroads. The gentlemen from Maryland need not think they are deceiving anybody when they say it is not; and it was decided at that time that five railroads should have access to this market, whereas only one would have access if the northeast site were adopted. [Applause.]

The position I am taking is that by reason of the action of this Congress thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested where this southwest market is supposed to be located. Now, are we going to have it said that after these people who have acted in good faith have made their investments near this site to the sum of more than \$500,000 we are going to back-track and by an Indian trick cause them the loss of the money they have invested?

I say this would not be fair to those who have invested their money in good faith where many new buildings have been erected, including warehouses, to be used solely for marketing purposes.

In my opinion it would be one of the best things possible for this market to be located at this site, so that, as has been stated here, there could not be a combination of commission men or anybody else against the consumers in the city of Washington.

As I have said, with me at this time it is a matter of good faith and this Congress should not violate its promise made that the market would be located here, thus inducing many to spend their money in making improvements with respect to the market that was to be established where designated in the authorization act.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Indiana states, this proposition was fought out two years ago on the floor of this House, and then the fight was carried to the Senate where it was also contested vigorously. I never heard anyone two years ago make the argument that the market was not needed. As I recall the arguments made two years ago, it seemed to be conceded by all that a market, such as this proposes, was needed. The only difference was whether it should be in the locality then selected or in some other locality.

If my memory serves me correctly, I was one of those who voted with a small minority in favor of the locality that was not selected by Congress.

But after the most exhaustive consideration, in which every point was made that has been made here to-day, the House, by a decided majority, decided to select the market in southwest Washington.

Then it went to the Senate, and after a vigorous fight between the Senators from Virginia and Maryland, in which it was conceded that the market was needed, the Senate confirmed the action of the House and voted for the location in southwest Washington.

Now it is proposed to make the fight all over again. As the gentleman from Indiana says, Congress has gone on record, and there are those who have involved themselves financially on the theory and the idea that Congress has authorized and located the market in southwest Washington.

I am surprised at the effort here—not to change the site—but an effort made to defeat it altogether. This is simply, gentlemen, an opposition that arises because another site was not selected.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. No; I have not the time.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The gentleman is making a statement that can not be backed up.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not yield. The gentleman was on the District of Columbia Committee—I do not know how he voted.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I voted for this site.

Mr. BYRNS. Then the gentleman at that time conceded that it was needed. It was approved by the District of Columbia Committee, of which the gentleman from Massachusetts was a member, and who now proposes to defeat the site altogether; it was approved by the Budget committee, it was approved by the President, and sent here in accordance with the law relating to the sending of estimates. The Committee on Appropriations acted in accordance with what was the overwhelming sentiment of Congress and has recommended this appropriation. I think it is a question of good faith, I think that the good faith of Congress is involved, and that this appropriation ought to be made. [Applause.]

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am in thorough sympathy with the chairman of our committee and with the minority leader of our committee on

this proposition. I take a few minutes to talk, not about the erection of the market but to discuss the appropriation sought to be used in the southwest for this market.

The objection that came to our committee was that the price of the property was too high, and that a limit should be placed on the price to be paid for this property. That was the subtle way of killing the market proposition for the District of Columbia.

You sat here the other day and heard our beloved Speaker of this House tell you what happened when the condemnation proceedings took place—that they paid 127 per cent more for the property than they needed than the assessed value of the same. And so this subcommittee brought in a limitation of only 25 per cent plus.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I have the figures here if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. MURPHY. The assessed valuation plus 25 per cent is the limit to be paid for this property.

Surely, ladies and gentlemen, there is something subtle underneath all this hullabaloo and furor, and I ask you gentlemen who represent districts from the South and send carloads of provisions that come from your soil headed north—I want to know if you are going to vote to abolish the chance for that freight to get into the District of Columbia on an equal basis with the freight that comes from other sections. [Applause.] You southern men, above all, can least afford to vote for this amendment now pending. Five railroads have gone in in good faith, believing what Congress has said, taking the word of Congress at 100 per cent, and have invested their money preparing for the day when you will appropriate the money to build for the people of the District of Columbia a suitable place for the produce hauled in here, not in wagons, my dear friend from Maryland, but by the trainload every day, to be consumed by the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Does not the gentleman realize that there is not one single carload of produce that comes to a farmers' market, but that kind of produce is consigned to commission men and jobbers?

Mr. MURPHY. The hearings state clearly what this is. It is the farmers' wholesale market, and the farmers from all over this country are interested in marketing their produce in the District of Columbia. Five railroads come into the District of Columbia in this location, and now, if we do what some want done here, but one railroad would bring the freight here to be consumed by the people of this District. I hope the House will maintain the honor and good faith of this House and vote against this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I shall not make the point of order if we can have this debate stopped at the end of 10 minutes, 5 minutes on a side. If that can not be done, I shall press the point of order, which is a good one, that all debate is exhausted on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. WINGO. If we can have debate for only 10 minutes more, 5 minutes on a side, I shall not press the point of order.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to this amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this proposal. My own position is, and I think it has been disclosed that the position of the subcommittee handling this bill is, that we are not in favor of the language in the bill before you. The main Committee on Appropriations overruled our recommendation as to it, and they stand sponsor for the proposal now before you. In view of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations took one position and my subcommittee took another position, I intended to remain silent in this debate, but I can not allow the statement to go by which was made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] to the effect that those who are in favor of a farmers' market have wings on their shoulders, and that there is something "subtle" in the opposition of those who are against the proposal, something sinister behind the recommendation that the subcommittee made to the main Committee on Appropriations. I resent it both for myself and the subcommittee. I concede to those who

are in favor of the proposal of a farmers' market the right to their own views. I think that I have a right and that the subcommittee over which I have been placed as chairman has a right to have its own opinion on the same matter without being charged with motives other than honest and sincere convictions as to what has been done and what should be done.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentleman is putting a very wrong interpretation on my remarks.

Mr. SIMMONS. I refuse to yield. The gentleman refused to yield to me. Last year this Congress authorized an appropriation of \$300,000, or so much thereof as is necessary, for a farmers' market. The subcommittee on appropriations which considered this matter deemed that \$250,000 is sufficient and that we should protect the taxpayers of Washington in figuring the amount that should be paid for the land. We were overruled by the main committee on that, and the proposal comes before you with their recommendation. We have talked about the farmers of the South and the farmers of the North, and sins have been committed in their name before this day, and we have talked about the railroads but there is no one here who has mentioned any obligation of the taxpayers of the city of Washington to furnish this market.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Not now. Here is an obligation placed on the taxpayers of the city of Washington, a charge, for the building of a wholesale produce market—not a retail market, but a wholesale market, and two Commissioners of the District testified against it, then the citizens associations of Washington, through their representatives, appeared against it, and there was practically nothing in its favor before our committee. You may use your own judgment, but speaking for myself and for the members of my subcommittee, I resent any implication in what has been said that we have any ulterior motive or any purpose in view other than to safeguard the taxpayers of the city of Washington.

There are two things which, in my judgment, Washington does not need. One of them is a wholesale produce market and the other is one located where this one is to be located. Those two things I think are very clear. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I wanted the gentleman to put into the Record from the hearings before his committee that this property is assessed at \$114,000, and that we are providing \$225,000 with which to purchase it.

Mr. SIMMONS. There is no doubt that this proposal authorizes the payment of more than 125 per cent of the assessed value. You are authorizing an expenditure of this kind at a time when the real-estate market of Washington is in a slump, and when it is common knowledge that you can buy real estate any place you want to in Washington at almost any price you are ready to pay, if you pay cash.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, this is not a little, light matter to be passed over thoughtlessly. As gentlemen on this committee stated, a contract has been made for this very place. This proposed market is for the service of the whole country. Of course, these men over in Virginia and Maryland who have a few wagon loads or truck loads of produce which is brought in here to feed our people for a few days have their own interests to serve; but this great city population must receive supplies of food from other sections of the country, not in little automobiles or wagons, but by trainloads. [Applause.]

I want to say that in a measure I have a selfish view in this matter. These fruits and vegetables and food supplies come from far away Texas; from the State of Mississippi; from the State of Florida; from the State of Georgia; from the State of Tennessee, and these railroads serve the people of Washington. Yet some man gets up here and argues against the pending provision because it may curtail some fellow with a wagon or two over here in Maryland or Virginia. [Laughter.]

This is a measure that has already been carefully passed on. Some members say, "Well, they may charge too much for the land." Of course, you must expect the public to be gouged when you condemn land in the city of Washington. I knew at the first that when we proposed to buy land it was their purpose to get a big price. The condemnation juries in the District of Columbia are willing to have it done. Yet people come here and object to it after Congress has agreed to it. You have brought it forth in this bill, and it would be foolish for us to overturn what we have done heretofore and turn it down simply because some people want to put it over on this Bladensburg Road, where they could not get the produce unless you tore up the streets and brought it over there in automobile trucks, whereas at the site agreed on, the railroads can pass right up there and unload the produce from the cars. I do want the man who produces the

vegetables back home to get the benefit of it, and not have it all go to the automobile traffic in the District of Columbia. Gentlemen, we ought to stand by the committee. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 40, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDSON: Page 7, line 15, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to purchase any ground where the price is more than 33 1/3 per cent above the assessed value as of January 1, 1930."

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment speaks for itself and needs no further explanation. It seems to me, in the light of the discussion before the House the other day by the honored and beloved Speaker of the House and the hearings had on the bill in committee, it is time we should put some limit or prohibition on the prices we have to pay to these real-estate jobbers in the District of Columbia. I hope the amendment may be carried. [Applause.]

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of this opportunity to say to my good friend from Nebraska, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. SIMMONS], that I did not intend anything personal to him in anything I said.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman tell the House what he meant by the use of the word "subtle"?

Mr. MURPHY. I did not use the word "subtle" in the sense of bringing it to bear upon anything with which the members of the committee are charged.

Mr. UNDERHILL. It is a suspicious word.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; it is a suspicious word, as the gentleman says.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman absolve me also? [Laughter.]

Mr. MURPHY. I did not know that the gentleman was charged.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I take it that the gentleman had a very subtle meaning in saying what he did.

Mr. MURPHY. In the use of language in heated debate one does sometimes encroach on the amenities and friendships which should exist between Members of the House. I hope the gentleman will accept this explanation.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. I rise in opposition to the amendment. Practically this same amendment was offered when the authorization was pending before the House two years ago, and it was defeated overwhelmingly. The same amendment was under consideration before the Committee on Appropriations and was defeated.

This is a proposition which, if adopted, would defeat the whole purpose of this appropriation. Something like 30 pieces of property are under consideration.

It just came to my attention to-day that there is a piece of property here, within two squares of the Capitol Building, where no reassessment has been made on the property for 20 years, and the property is assessed at \$4,000, when it can go on the open market and be sold for \$14,000.

So that until our entire assessment proposition has been gone into an amendment like this is unfair.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. No; I can not yield now.

There is one piece of property in this lot which is to be purchased valued at \$75,000. The assessed valuation is \$45,000. So, with this amendment, it will be impossible to purchase any of the property unless all of it can be purchased at these figures, and the commissioners are placed in a position where it is absolutely impossible to buy any of it, with the amendment as proposed.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned in an address on the floor a few minutes ago the difference between Major Atkins, purchasing agent for the District, and the House Office Building Commission. One reason why Major Atkins has been able to make the record he has made is because we have carried a limitation of 125 per cent. As soon as it is known that a piece of property is to be purchased and an amount of money is appropriated, then the property owners, in furtherance of the scheme mentioned by the Speaker a few days ago, fix their prices at the amount appropriated.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Is it not a fact that on almost all of this property they refuse to fix a price at the present time?

Mr. HOLADAY. I think that is true, but if we want to do what the Speaker mentioned the other day—that is, break up this business of selling real estate to the Government at two or three times what it is worth—put on this limitation of 133 per cent—and you will keep them down to within 33 per cent of what it is worth.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield for a question.

Mr. BYRNS. I would like to ask the gentleman whether, in his opinion, the adoption of this amendment would not defeat the whole proposition?

Mr. HOLADAY. No. In my opinion it would not. In my opinion, if we did not spend a dollar of public money the railroad company, which some gentlemen here are so solicitous about, would out of their own pockets buy the property and build the building.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The railroads are prohibited by statute from doing that.

Mr. BYRNS. My question was whether or not the gentleman thinks the Government can purchase this property offered, subject to the limitation of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Certainly, the Government does not want the railroad companies to buy any property for the Government's use.

Mr. HOLADAY. I think the Government can purchase it, and I think it will be sold subject to that limitation. That is my opinion.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman assure the House that without this amendment the Government can purchase the property for the amount carried in the appropriation bill?

Mr. HOLADAY. I can not assure that, but the amount available is at least twice what it is worth, and, of course, the owners will sell it for that amount if they can not get more.

Mr. BYRNS. I understood the gentleman to intimate in his first response to my question that there is some doubt in his mind that the property could be purchased with the limitation provided in the amendment, because the gentleman coupled with it the fact that he thought the railroads would be willing to purchase the site. Certainly this Congress does not want to put itself in the position of leaving it to a railroad company to buy property for the use of the Government.

Mr. HOLADAY. No. But, they propose to buy this for the use of the railroad and not for the use of the Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I just want to make this observation. We broke out in quite a furor over the payment of exorbitant prices by the Government for real estate in Washington. This has been going on for a long time. I want to observe that if numerous gentlemen of the House who have been competing with Amos and Andy over the radio, telling why the people should have the vote in the District of Columbia, would talk about the moral issue involved in giving the Government value in property or service in exchange for Government money they might do the country more good.

Real-estate dealers in Washington are not any different than anybody else in Washington. The idea is "get all you can and give as little as you have to." There are a lot of people under civil service. They have not any past; they have not any future, they will not quit, they can not be fired, they want their wages increased, they want retirement, and they get it. I do not know why it is called "civil service," except that they are not civil, and they do not give the service. That seems to be the whole attitude in dealing with the Government. I did not suppose it was such a bad thing to work for the Government.

Many well-qualified people in my district write me to get them a job here. It is worse in Washington than out in the Provinces. Until we take a different attitude in dealing with the Government, I doubt if the Government can expect anything different from the citizen. We should let it be known that the Government is not to be fair game for the citizen to plunder, and until we take that attitude this will go on. If these gentlemen now engaged in this evangelistic work on the radio, trying to get the vote, direct their effort to this situation, we might get farther. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. STALKER. Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the value of this real estate. When this bill was originally written it was not known by the owners of the real estate that the authorization of \$300,000 was to include the cost of improvements to the property. These improvements contemplate grading, paving, erecting sheds, offices, and so forth, and the cost thereof will approximate \$75,000. This leaves \$225,000 for the land alone, or \$112,500 for each city block. In order that this land might be secured by the Government within this authorization the largest property owner, who owns more than one-third of the land in question, agreed to accept \$2.07 per square foot, whereas the District Commissioners estimate if they are compelled to condemn this same property it would cost at least \$2.52 per square foot.

It should be remembered that the owners of the squares involved were not the ones that suggested the farmers' market be located thereon. On the contrary, they recommended a site on the water front which is public property. Major Somervell, Army district engineer in charge of the water-front development, stated that this would conflict with their plans of development of the water front, and therefore recommended the two blocks in question. This location was also indorsed by Mr. Moore, chairman of the Fine Arts Commission.

There has been no speculation in this property. Many of the present owners have held title for at least 20 years, and I do not believe that any transfers have been made within 5 years.

The authorized appropriation of \$300,000 contemplates \$75,000 for improvements, leaving approximately \$225,000 for the ground. (See estimate submitted by the Board of Commissioners and approved by the Director of the Budget, also statement of engineer commissioner, p. 780, hearings on District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1931.) This figure of \$225,000, which is 160.5 per cent of assessed valuation, was arrived at by Major Atkins, assistant engineer commissioner, on the following basis:

Number of lots	Owner	Number of square feet	Total Price	Price per square foot
15	For purchase:			
	Terminal Refrigerating & Warehousing Corporation.....	34,820	\$72,000	\$2.07
9	R. Harrison Johnson, agent.....	18,275	37,546	2.30
1	Isabelle Johnson.....	1,722	8,000	4.64
	Total for purchase.....	52,817	117,546	2.22
5	For condemnation:			
	Riley.....	35,283	75,000	2.12
	Various owners.....	12,623	31,830	2.52
	Total for condemnation.....	47,906	106,830	2.23
	Grand total.....	100,723	224,376	2.22

Specifically, take the case of the Riley property, which is listed by the District Commissioners at \$75,000 under condemnation procedure. The assessed valuation of this property is \$45,119; 125 per cent of this assessed valuation is \$56,398. From official experience the commissioners consider it will be necessary to pay \$75,000, or 166 per cent of the assessment. This one case alone would kill the whole project, as these parcels of land are scattered between squares 354 and 355.

The fair value of the land and improvements to be acquired has been appraised by expert appraisers authorized to testify in condemnation proceedings at \$257,562—see commissioners' hearing record, page 268. The total assessed valuation is \$139,768, which is so low in proportion to present market values that it would have no weight in a condemnation of the property.

It is claimed in the subcommittee's report that this 125 per cent proviso is inserted in every case for the procurement of land for schools, playgrounds, fire stations, and so forth. That may be practicable where the particular site is not specifically fixed and determined by the act of authorization. The act of March 2, 1929, specifies two particular squares which must be acquired, and in these circumstances it is obviously incongruous to make the restriction of 125 per cent of assessed value, which can not be here applied.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

For personal services, \$223,650.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 7, line 17, strike out the figures "\$223,650" and insert in lieu thereof "\$224,150."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For incidental and all other general necessary expenses authorized by law, \$2,700.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: Page 9, line 8, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"That section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913 (37 U. S. Stat. 974) be amended by adding four new paragraphs, Nos. 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b, to read as follows:

"PAR. 2a. That the commission is hereby authorized and empowered to require any and all corporations, companies, associations, joint-stock companies or associations, partnerships, and persons, their lessees, trustees, or receivers, appointed by any court whatsoever, operating, controlling, or managing any motor cabs or other vehicles for the conveyance of persons within the District of Columbia for hire, except such common carriers as have been expressly exempted from the jurisdiction of the commission, to satisfy the commission, in such way or ways as it may prescribe, of their ability to discharge any claims for damages adjudged against them.

"PAR. 2b. No vehicle included within the terms of paragraph 2a shall hereinafter operate in said service without first having obtained from the commission a certificate that public convenience and necessity require such operation; but a certificate shall be granted when it appears to the satisfaction of the commission that the owner or operator of any such vehicle or vehicles was actually operating in good faith such a service on May 1, 1930, and had complied as of that date with all lawful orders of the commission regulating such service.

"PAR. 3a. That whenever, after full hearing, upon a complaint, or in an investigation made by the commission on its own initiative, the commission shall be of opinion that any rate, fare, or charge whatsoever demanded, charged, or collected by any public utility is or will be unjust, unreasonable, or unjustly discriminatory, or otherwise in violation of any of the provisions of this act, the commission is hereby authorized and empowered to determine and prescribe what will be the just and reasonable rate, fare, or charge to be thereafter observed, or the maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum to be charged.

"PAR. 3b. No common carrier shall hereafter operate for the transportation of persons over highways, streets, or avenues within the District of Columbia without first securing authority from the commission, and the commission, when public convenience and necessity so require, may prescribe routes for such operation, designate places for taking on and/or discharging passengers, and prohibit the use of highways, streets, or avenues for terminal purposes."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska reserves a point of order against the amendment and the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the act creating the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia resulted from a rider on the District of Columbia appropriation bill in 1913. Therefore I feel that the gentleman should not insist upon his point of order against my amendment. Another reason I appeal for immediate consideration is that my amendment is offered to meet an emergency.

When Congress passed the law creating the utilities commission naturally it was thought sufficient power to properly regulate passenger-carrying vehicles had been granted, but through legal opinions and court decisions the commission finds that it is powerless to exercise jurisdiction over motor cabs and motor busses.

My amendment is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLeod], approved in full by the Public Utilities Commission. I talked with Mr. McLeod about the bill, and he advises me that until his subcommittee disposes of the merger legislation it can not consider this important measure. He has approved of my suggestion to offer it as an amendment on the floor. It gives the commission power to require the operators of a passenger-carrying vehicle to satisfy the commission of their ability to satisfy any claims for damages adjudged against them, further to regulate rates when necessary, and also control over interstate busses in so far as prescribing routes for such operation, designate places for taking on and for discharging passengers, and to prohibit the use of certain highways, streets, or avenues for terminal purposes.

At the present time there are operating in the District of Columbia nearly 2,500 motor cabs, and not one-fifth of the cabs have assets upon which a passenger could levy if injured and a judgment secured against the owner.

Citizens of the District of Columbia, as well as visitors, have been injured by the score, many permanently, who can secure no redress, although in many instances the courts have rendered judgments against the operators.

Last week I learned a friend of mine had been seriously injured in a taxicab accident. He was required to enter a hospital, and in the end, when he sought reimbursement from the operator, he found the only assets the man had was a cab worth not more than \$200. This caused me to make a little investigation. I talked with the members of the Public Utilities Commission. I was amazed that, although Congress has charged the commission with certain responsibilities in so far as motor cabs are concerned, it has not granted by law sufficient authority to carry out its mandate.

I learn the public has practically no protection should a citizen suffer physical or property damage.

Since January 1, 65 major accidents have occurred in the District of Columbia where a motor cab was involved. I speak now of the more serious accidents. In 50 out of the 65 cases the party suffering will never be able to realize any damages; first, because the cab was not insured; and second, because the operators have no assets.

Recently judgments amounting to \$18,000 were levied against a company operating under the name of a large Washington hotel. Will they pay the judgments? No. This company is now preparing to file a petition in bankruptcy if it has not already done so.

One of the large companies, which one would judge from the number of taxicabs bearing its name was sound financially, has absolutely no assets but its patented name. This it leases to operators of their own cars for \$15 a year. The company owning the name has no cabs of its own and controls no cabs. All that is necessary to operate a motor cab in the city of Washington is for the owner to secure a license, the cost of which is \$1 for the hackers' license and \$9 for the livery license. Cabs can be bought, used cabs, for as low as \$125.

Within the last 30 days 233 motor cabs have been licensed to carry passengers. They are operated by four companies, and the companies do not even own the cabs. This fleet is known as the 35-cent cabs. One of my colleagues stated yesterday, when I spoke to him about this amendment, that it would put these cabs out of commission. The amendment will do nothing of the kind. It might require them to charge 40 cents for the trip rather than 35 cents if they must provide insurance, but the general public certainly should be willing to pay the extra nickel, knowing they were protected in event of accident.

Any one who operates a motor cab for the conveyance of the public should be required to carry insurance or submit proper guaranties of their ability to discharge a judgment in the event one was levied. Reckless motor-car drivers cover the streets of the city, and I feel the commission should be given the power to control the situation.

We should protect the people of Washington and our constituents who visit this city and who use the motor busses.

I submit again that an emergency exists, and I sincerely hope that the gentleman will permit the House to vote on my amendment and not insist upon his point of order.

Members of this committee have publicly complained of traffic conditions. There are over 700 motor busses coming into Washington every day, and under existing conditions the commission has no control whatsoever over them. They park where they desire and use such thoroughfares as they care to. My amendment will afford relief. I have a list of many accidents where people have been permanently disabled, which confirms my statement that there is need now for the proper regulation of motor cabs in the District of Columbia. The two letters following were written to me by the Public Utilities Commission:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

Washington, March 24, 1930.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In compliance with your oral request of to-day for certain information in connection with H. R. No. 10742 and bill No. 10781, the following is submitted:

The records of the license bureau, District of Columbia, indicate that during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, the following tags were issued:

H tags	1,837
L tags	804
Total	2,641

The following 1930 tags have been issued from January 1 to March 22, 1930:

H tags	1,418
L tags	1,033
Now operating	2,451

It is to be remembered that the figures shown for the number of 1930 tags issued cover only an approximate three months' record from the license bureau.

The 35-cent cab companies known to the commission and the number of 1930 L tags issued to them, according to the license bureau, are as follows:

Bell Cab Co.	86
Sun Cab Co.	50
City Cab Co.	77
Circle Cab Co.	20

The following is submitted relative to traffic accidents involving cars operating under H and L tags, according to the records of the office of the director of traffic:

	Accidents
For the calendar year 1929	378
From January 1 to March 23, 1930, inclusive	65

The commission earnestly requests that H. R. No. 10742, introduced by Representative McLEOD, be considered.

Yours very truly,

MASON M. PATRICK.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

Washington, March 25, 1930.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Supplementing our letter of March 24, the following additional information which you requested is submitted:

During the past few months four new taxicab companies have obtained garage livery licenses and have equipped their vehicles with "L" tags. The commission has been advised to-day that the "Stop Me" Cab Co. has recently purchased 50 cabs to operate on a flat 35-cent rate. Numerous drivers with "H" tags are now operating at 35 cents in defiance of the commission's order, claiming that they are forced to do so by competition of the "L" tag drivers. It is apparent that "L" tags are now being procured in preference to "H" tags for the purpose of violating the intent of present legislation.

There are companies like the New Era Cab Co. which operate on a 35-cent basis without "L" tags. Some cabs are equipped with meters but charge on a flat rate basis. Many independents have changed their cabs to a flat rate without changing their tags. Most of the offenders ignore the commission so far as filing rate schedules is concerned.

A check of the garages indicates that companies operating on "L" tags are not dispatching the cars from garages but stationing these cars on the public streets throughout the city, where they are dispatched from offices, telephone call boxes, and accept fares from the street. Under present regulations cars equipped with "L" tags may park anywhere and enjoy the same privilege of privately owned vehicles. It is reported that "L" tags are issued to garages in excess of the number of cars which the garages will accommodate, thus adding to the confusion.

The commission believes that under the authority of legislation as proposed in H. R. bill 10742 the public will be amply protected through the commission by adequate insurance, standard rates, periodic inspection, and a closer check on the operators of these vehicles.

Yours very truly,

MASON M. PATRICK.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is there anything in the gentleman's proposal that would limit the authority of the commissioners to turn the highways of Washington over to the taxicab companies?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The last paragraph of the amendment gives the Public Utilities Commission power to tell the interstate busses what streets they can use in coming into

Washington when they come here. There are 750 interstate busses coming into the District of Columbia every day.

Mr. SIMMONS. And none of them have any place on which to operate except the streets.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman is correct; no stations. As I have said, the last paragraph of the amendment gives the commissioners the power to tell them where they can go, where they can pick up passengers and where they can discharge passengers.

Mr. SIMMONS. Would the gentleman mind offering an amendment to his proposal which would require the District authorities to tell them to get off the streets and rent tax-paying structures, so they will not use the public streets for the purpose of picking up and discharging passengers?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I should judge if they had that power they would exercise it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think they ought to exercise it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The purpose of my amendment is to require the taxicab companies operating in the District of Columbia to satisfy the commissioners that in the event anyone is injured they have the necessary amount of money to pay damages, to regulate rates, if necessary, and to be in a position to say something to busses doing an interstate business and using the streets of the city. As it is, the commission is hopeless to remedy the present situation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase and installation of electric traffic lights, signals and controls, markers, painting white lines, labor, and such other expenses as may be necessary in the judgment of the commissioners, \$103,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act, or that is now available, shall be expended for building, installing, and maintaining street-car loading platforms and lights of any description employed to distinguish same.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he can give us information as to just what traffic lights are to be installed under the appropriation carried in this bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the gentleman will peruse this map, he will get all of that information, while the Clerk continues the reading of the bill.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Is it the purpose to install a traffic light at the Peace Monument?

Mr. SIMMONS. No, sir.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Is it the purpose to install a light at the intersection of Massachusetts Avenue, North Capitol and F Streets, near the post-office building?

Mr. SIMMONS. A light is proposed at New Jersey Avenue and G Street.

Mr. COLLINS. These are technical matters which the committee felt could better be left to the director of traffic to determine.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. May I say that my observation is that they are installing lights at street crossings where there is only one-fifth of the traffic there is at the Peace Monument or the intersection near the post office just mentioned by me?

Mr. COLLINS. Technical experts take into consideration many things that this committee can not consider and that we should not consider.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Is the committee reporting out this bill with an authorization for traffic lights without knowing what traffic lights are to be installed?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have told the gentleman that he could come here and study the map which we have. We could not print this in the hearings, although we have all the information here.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Is it proposed to install a traffic light between the House Office Building and the Capitol?

Mr. COLLINS. The committee left these questions to the director of traffic. Only the amount of appropriation was determined.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. I wish to say I am very much impressed with the idea—

Mr. COLLINS. The committee can not decide matters of discretion that should be exercised by administrators better qualified to pass upon them than members of the committee.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. I feel that the committee which appropriates money for this purpose ought to know for what purpose the money is to be spent, and I do not feel that they have any right to shift the burden in a case like this.

My observation is they are installing lights where there is very little traffic, when at intersections like Peace Monument,

F Street, Massachusetts Avenue and North Capitol Street, where the traffic is five times as heavy as other places where traffic lights are installed, there are no traffic lights whatever. We have a situation between the House Office Building and the Capitol where there are absolutely no traffic lights and yet this committee representing the District of Columbia, or making appropriations for the District of Columbia, does not know whether the lives of Members of Congress are to be safeguarded in going from the Capitol to the House Office Building or not.

Let me say further that a few minutes ago some gentleman made the suggestion that pedestrians ought not to walk against a red traffic light. We have a traffic light on the Capitol Grounds, between the Capitol and the House Office Building, and there is a red light the entire time so as to prevent pedestrians crossing the street. There is not a single second of time when a pedestrian would have the right to walk all the way across that street. He can walk half way across the street, stand there, and then finally go across the street, but the red light is first turned against him one way and then it is turned the other way immediately before he can get all the way across the street.

Mr. HUDSON. You can go around the block.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. You can go entirely around the block or you can refuse to come to the Capitol. It is either one of these or run for your life.

Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that there is something very wrong somewhere. I want to locate it. Why are the traffic lights now in use and those proposed for the future so arranged as to leave unprotected several of the most dangerous crossings in the city? Why are not all needed lights installed at once? Who is to blame for this willful failure, as I see it, to take care of the pedestrian? Do the commissioners object to these dangerous crossings being protected or are the traffic officials to blame? Is the Congress unwilling to pay for the necessary traffic lights to guard these death holes? Where is the trouble and why is it?

It seems very evident that this subcommittee does not know and does not care. It further seems that they are willing to make lump-sum appropriations without at all going into the merits of the appropriation and determining whether or not the money is to be properly spent. It seems to me that there should be some effort by some one to determine whether the lights to be installed are the most necessary and whether or not there are not other places that should be protected where there is five times the cause for these lights.

The chairman a few minutes ago said that there is to be installed a traffic light at New Jersey Avenue and G Street. This though is about a block away from the dangerous intersection at North Capitol, Massachusetts Avenue, and F Street near the Post Office and is where the traffic is much lighter than at the dangerous point just mentioned by me. I know also that there are some very fine lights on E Street just a block away from the dangerous intersection mentioned by me, and they can be observed functioning very beautifully all the while with very little traffic there, while close by the great mass of tangled and dangerous traffic is grinding the mill of death with absolutely no light whatever. Oh, some one says that a traffic policeman can be seen at the dangerous intersection mentioned by me. Yes; some times, but often he is not there. When he is there he tries to take care of the street cars and automobiles and evidently does nothing to protect the pedestrian.

If some of my friends on this committee will stand at a corner and watch a traffic policeman in Washington direct traffic for a few minutes he will see that he is doing nothing to protect the man, woman, or child on foot. For all the world he appears to be directing an attack on the pedestrians by the automobile drivers. He sees some people afoot about to get across the street and turns the automobiles into them. He sees that they are about to escape and he immediately does all he can to hurry the automobiles into the mass of men, women, and children who are hurrying for their lives. He sees that they have finally reached the sidewalk and then he turns and sees that several men, women, and children are about to cross another street, and with apparent indignation he directs an attack upon these defenseless people and with gesture and apparent grim determination hurries along the already careless and oftentimes criminal autoist.

I repeat there is apparently no purpose to take care of the pedestrian.

Lights are being installed on streets where they are not needed and the traffic is being diverted to the streets where there is already extremely dangerous crossings. Every light installed on H or E Street NW., near the Post Office, drives more and more traffic upon F and North Capitol near the Post Office. I find, though, that the program is to still further place lights on the streets where they are not needed and still further congest the dangerous streets. Thus, some of the lights about to be installed instead of helping are making the most

dangerous places even more dangerous. I wonder why the lights are installed on these streets where the traffic is so light.

To my mind, there is no place more dangerous than near the Post Office and at Peace Monument. I want the commissioners, the traffic bureau, or some one to tell me why this gross discrimination against these two places. I shall not be satisfied until some one tells me why these points are not protected.

Traffic lights are very valuable at Dupont Circle and several other congested points. Why not install them at once where needed throughout the city?

I believe that if we would take a little more time in an effort to work out something for the benefit of the pedestrian who uses the street, the District of Columbia appropriation bill would be in just a little better condition than it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwest: Morningside Drive, Alaska Avenue to Kalmia Road, \$23,800.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 25, after line 24, insert the following:

"Northwest: Eighth Street, Marietta Place to Quackenbos Street, \$16,500.

"Northwest: Quackenbos Street, Georgia Avenue to Eighth Street, \$11,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$1,950,100; to be disbursed and accounted for as "Gasoline tax, road and street improvements," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund and be available immediately: *Provided*, That no part of such fund shall be used for the improvement of any street or section thereof not herein specified: *Provided further*, That assessments in accordance with existing law shall be made for paving and repaving roadways where such roadways are paved or repaved with funds derived from the collection of the tax on motor-vehicle fuels and accretions by repayment of assessments: *Provided further*, That in the performance of the street-paving work specially provided for in this act priority shall be given to those streets which are more in the nature of through thoroughfares or arterial highways.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: On page 30, line 4, strike out the figures "\$1,950,100" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,978,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purpose of making a study of the power needs of the District of Columbia with a view to establishing a municipally owned and operated service therefor, \$25,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: On page 41, line 22, after the word "therefor," insert the following: "including the employment, by contract or otherwise, of such expert and other personal services as shall be approved by the commissioners, without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended, and necessary incidental expenses."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: For personal services of teachers and librarians in accordance with the act approved June 4, 1924 (43 Stat. 367-375), \$6,188,840: *Provided*, That teachers employed in kindergartens are hereby made eligible for transfer to teach in grades 1 to 4, inclusive, of the elementary schools.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order on that part of the paragraph beginning with the word "*Provided*," on line 14, page 42, the balance of the paragraph, on the ground that it is new legislation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I admit the point of order, and will offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, line 14, in lieu of the language stricken out insert the following:

"*Provided*, That as teacher vacancies occur during the fiscal year 1931 in grades 1 to 4, inclusive, of the elementary schools such vacancies shall not be filled by new appointments, but shall be filled by the assignment of teachers now employed in kindergartens, and teachers employed in kindergartens are hereby made eligible to teach in the said grades."

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill and seeks to accomplish exactly what was intended to be accomplished by the language which has just been stricken out. It is another form of the same proposition that was ruled out by the Chair as not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska does not attempt to conceal the fact that it is legislation, but it is legislation which comes clearly within the Holman rule. First, it is an amendment to an appropriation bill; second, it is germane to the paragraph under consideration; third, it retrenches expenditures. The purpose of the bill is clear that where a vacancy occurs in the position of teacher in the kindergarten the teacher may be promoted to that grade instead of appointing a new teacher. The amendment as drawn is a perfect example of legislation on an appropriation bill within the Holman rule.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Where language in a paragraph is declared out of order as legislation, can it be introduced under the guise of an amendment when it is the same subject matter?

The CHAIRMAN. That happens in almost every appropriation bill, where language is stricken out and then an amendment offered that comes within the Holman rule—that is repeatedly held in order.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. This is not a proper amendment—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has said that this amendment is a perfect example of legislation on an appropriation bill within the Holman rule, and the Chair has overruled the point of order.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. I do not feel that this is a proper manner to consider a matter of this importance, with so few Members on the floor, when it concerns such a large number of the people of the District of Columbia. In the first place, the amendment is intended to eliminate a certain amount of kindergarten instruction to little tots 4 years old. It proposes at the same time to change the policy of the Board of Education in this city as to the qualifications of teachers in the elementary grades. It proposes further to undertake to divide the time of kindergarten teachers between schools on one side of the District of Columbia and those of another part of the District. In every way it would work an injury to the schools, damage to the teachers and to these little tots who are taught in kindergarten work. It does not seem to me that, on the ground of economy, we ought to cripple the schools of the city of Washington. It is all right to have economy, but it is better to have good schools first and let economy follow in their management. This amendment is plainly an attempt to force in the proposition, already ruled out of order, an attempt to do indirectly what could not be done directly, and it will cause serious injury to the kindergarten work in the District schools. The amendment ought to be voted down. It ought to be voted on when there is a larger number of Members present who can participate in the discussion and in the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I discussed this proposal at length during general debate. I think it is sufficient now to state it does not interfere with the plan of the school officials. It has the approval of the school superintendent and of the three assistant superintendents. It eliminates no essential part of the kindergarten work, and only in very remote instances, and I do not think it will ever happen, will a teacher be teaching schools in two parts of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin (during the count). Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL of Wisconsin) there were—ayes, 22, noes, 12.
So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 42, line 14, after the figures "367-375," insert the following: "and professors in salary class 9."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of an 8-room addition to the Whittier School, \$150,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 51, line 21, strike out "\$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$120,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

METROPOLITAN POLICE SALARIES

For the pay and allowances of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of the Metropolitan police force, the United States park police force, and the fire department of the District of Columbia" (43 Stat. 174-175), including compensation at the rate of \$2,100 per annum for the present assistant property clerk of the police department, \$2,762,880: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person appointed during the fiscal year 1931 as a private on the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia who has not completed an eighth-grade common-school education.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: Page 56, line 20, strike out the proviso beginning in line 20 and ending in line 25.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this proviso will prevent the appointment of any private on the police force of the District of Columbia who has not had an eighth-grade common school education. I regret it is not subject to a point of order, as it is most obnoxious to me. When the bill was reported I was discussing this limitation with some friends and remarked that it did not require an eighth-World War. Since then I understand some of the papers have grade common school education to serve the country during the also brought this up. If this proviso becomes a law, Sergt. Alvin C. York, who distinguished himself during the war, could not be appointed to the Washington police force. The story of his life contains this statement:

He finished school with the equivalent of a second-grade education. It is doubtful whether he could have passed the second grade. He is not educated "in the larnin that comes out of books," as he puts it.

Can anyone say that Sergeant York is not an intelligent man? He, along with tens of thousands of his buddies, can not make the grade if you pass this proviso.

Many of the leading jurists of the country could never have qualified if it was required that they show a certificate of graduation from a recognized law school. They studied law by the light of the candle, later passing the necessary examinations. History is replete with men who have made their mark in this country who were deprived of an eighth-grade school education.

Many men who have served in this House could never have qualified had the Constitution provided that it was necessary for a Member to have had an eight-grade common-school education. You do not make provisions for an education equivalent to an eighth-grade education, but you rule against all who have not graduated from an eighth-grade school.

The prerequisites for a position on the Washington police force should be: (1) Is the man sound physically and mentally; (2) is he honest; and (3) does he have the nerve to discharge the duties of a patrolman? Find men with such qualifications and you will have real policemen regardless of whether or not they have had an eighth-grade education. The proviso should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, the committee feels that all of the requirements the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has mentioned are proper, and they are now required. Sergeant York would also be barred on account of his age. Certain height and weight and age requirements are fixed. After due consideration and consulting with the superintendent of police, the committee felt that this move is in the direction of securing a better police force.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIVISION OF CHILD WELFARE

Administration: For administrative expenses, including placing and visiting children, city directory, purchase of books of reference and periodicals not exceeding \$50, and all office and sundry expenses, \$4,000; and no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used for the purpose of visiting any ward of the Board of Public Welfare placed outside the District of Columbia and the States of Virginia and Maryland, and a ward placed outside said District and the States of Virginia and Maryland shall be visited not less than once a year by a voluntary agent or correspondent of said board, and that said board shall have power, upon proper showing, in its discretion, to discharge from guardianship any child committed to its care.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee concerning the item on page 72, lines 12, 13, and 14. Just what does this language mean?

Said board shall have power, upon proper showing, in its discretion, to discharge from guardianship any child committed to its care.

In relation to that part of this section I have had some letters of inquiry, and I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee just what that language means.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Board of Public Welfare has charge of the care of children temporarily committed by the juvenile court.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Temporarily committed where?

Mr. SIMMONS. To the care of the Board of Public Welfare. It may be in an institution, or it may be out, where we are paying board for those committed. They are placed in the care of the Board of Public Welfare.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Is this new legislation?

Mr. SIMMONS. No. This has been in the bill since 1922. The misunderstanding in respect to the Board of Public Welfare has been cleared up in the hearings.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. What did the hearings develop?

Mr. SIMMONS. The judge of the juvenile court objected to the Board of Public Welfare discharging these charges without the consent of the court. The board was given jurisdiction of these children on the theory that they were the best judges of what should be done with them, rather than the juvenile court. I think in the future there will be no conflict. I think it will work out more satisfactorily than heretofore. There have been only a few instance where there has been any trouble.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York withdraws the pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance, under the jurisdiction of the Board of Public Welfare, of a suitable place in a building entirely separate and apart from the House of Detention for the reception and detention of children under 17 years of age arrested by the police on charge of offense against any laws in force in the District of Columbia, or committed to the guardianship of the board, or held as witnesses, or held temporarily, or pending hearing, or otherwise, including transportation, operation, and maintenance of motor vehicles, food, clothing, medicine and medical supplies, rental, repair, and upkeep of buildings, fuel, gas, electricity, ice, supplies, and equipment, and other necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$17,490 for personal services, \$41,250.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 73, line 15, strike out the figures "\$17,490" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$18,240."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For personal services, \$4,740; maintenance, \$9,200; and repairs to building, including not to exceed \$1,500 for furnishing and installing fire escape, \$2,000; in all, \$15,940, to be expended under the direction of the commissioners; and Union ex-soldiers, sailors, or marines of the Civil War, ex-soldiers, sailors, or marines of the Spanish War, Philippine insurrection, or China relief expedition, and soldiers, sailors, or marines of the World War or who served prior to July 2, 1921, shall be admitted to the home, all under the supervision of a board of management.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 83, line 14, after the word "building," insert the following: "and grounds."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the use of water for domestic purposes through unmetered services, \$9.85 per annum for all tenements two stories high, or less, with a front width of 16 feet, or less; for each additional front foot or fraction thereof greater than one-half, 62 cents; and for each additional story or part thereof, one-third of the charges as computed above. For business places that are not required to install meters under existing regulations, the present rates to be increased by 40 per cent per annum. For the use of water through metered services, a minimum charge of \$8.75 per annum for 7,500 cubic feet of water, and 7 cents per 100 cubic feet for water used in excess of that quantity. For water for building construction purposes when not supplied through a meter, 6 cents per 1,000 brick and 3 cents per cubic yard of concrete, with a minimum charge of \$1 for each separate building project. All water required for purposes which are not covered by the foregoing classifications shall be paid for at such rates as may be fixed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the rate of assessment for laying or constructing water mains in the District of Columbia under the provisions of the act entitled "An act authorizing the laying of water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes," approved April 22, 1904 (33 Stat., p. 244), is hereby increased from \$2 to \$3 per linear front foot for any water main laid during the fiscal year 1931 and thereafter: *Provided further*, That the said commissioners are authorized to use of the receipts from water rents and water-main taxes in the fiscal year 1931 not to exceed \$20,000 as an additional amount for the purchase and installation of one 20,000,000-gallon pump at the Bryant Street pumping station, including economizer and generator, and not to exceed \$25,000 as an additional amount for installing and replacing water meters on services to private residences and such business places as are not required to install water meters under the existing regulations.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 97, strike out the proviso beginning on line 20 and ending on line 5, page 98.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LAGUARDIA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10813) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, reported that that committee had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SIMMONS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, after the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's table, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] asks unanimous consent that on Monday, at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] may proceed for 45 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] would make that conditional on whether we have anything else of special importance on that day.

Mr. GARNER. If there is a report from the Rules Committee or any very important matter, I will consider that.

Mr. SNELL. Then, it may go over?

Mr. GARNER. Well, it is very important that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] speak on next Monday, if he is going to speak at all.

Mr. SNELL. Two or three gentlemen have asked for an opportunity to address the House early next week, and I have told them that I would have to object until we had a chance to find out what was going to be the course of procedure.

Mr. GARNER. As I understand, we are going to adjourn over until Monday?

Mr. SNELL. I am going to ask unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. GARNER. Therefore, this is the only opportunity I will have to ask for this unanimous consent. I would like to have it to-day, for the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] is prepared and wanted to speak to-day or to-morrow, but I did not want to object to adjourning over until Monday. I hope the gentleman from New York will allow him to have 45 minutes on Monday.

Mr. SNELL. I will be compelled to consent, I suppose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 9680) to amend the act entitled "An act granting certain lands to the city of Biloxi, in Harrison County, Miss., for park and cemetery purposes," approved April 28, 1906, which has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] has conferred with the chairmen of the committees?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

TRADE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PACIFIC

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an extract from a speech made by William Henry Seward in 1852, prophesying just what the trade development of the Pacific would be, and an article by my colleague, Mr. KORELL, of Oregon, showing how truly this prophecy has been fulfilled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 1852, just 78 years ago, William Henry Seward, then United States Senator from New York, and later a member of President Lincoln's Cabinet, in the course of a debate advocating an appropriation for an economic survey of the Pacific for the purposes of trade development, made a prophecy as to the importance that the commerce on the Pacific would eventually assume, and this in the light of present events is a little less than astonishing, and one can not but marvel at the clarity of his vision and his appreciation of what the acquisition of this new territory meant.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH OF WILLIAM HENRY SEWARD

The settlement of the Pacific coast is in a state of sheer infancy. There is, speaking relatively, neither capital nor labor there adequate to exhibit the forces of industry that might be employed in that wonderful region * * *. The railway across Panama is not yet completed. The passage through Nicaragua is not perfect; that which leads through Tehuantepec is not begun; nor have we yet extended, even so far as to the Mississippi, the most important and necessary one of them all, the railroad across our own country to San Francisco * * *. Nevertheless, the commercial, social, political movements of the world are now in the direction of California * * *. Without waiting for perfect or safe channels, a strong and steady stream of emigration flows thither from every State and every district eastward of the Rocky Mountains. Similar torrents of emigration are pouring into California and Australia from the South American States, from Europe, and from Asia. This movement is not a sudden, or accidental, or irregular, or convulsive one; but it is one for which men and nature have been preparing through near 400 years. During all that time merchants and princes have been seeking how they could reach cheaply and expeditiously, "Cathay," "China," "the East," that intercourse and commerce might be established between its ancient nations and the newer ones of the West. To these objects Da Gama, Columbus, Americus, Cabot, Hudson, and other navigators devoted their talents, their labors, and their lives. Even the discovery of this continent and its islands, and the organization of society and government upon them, grand and important as these events have been, were but conditional, preliminary, and ancillary to the more sublime result now in the act of consummation—the reunion of the two civilizations, which having parted on the plains of Asia 4,000 years ago and having traveled ever afterwards in opposite directions around the world, now meet again on the coasts and islands of the Pacific Ocean. Certainly, no mere human event of equal dignity and importance has ever occurred upon the earth. * * *

Sir, have you considered the basis of this movement, that this continent and Australia are capable of sustaining and need for their development five hundred millions, while their population is confined to 50,000,000, and yet that Asia has two hundred millions of excess? As for those who doubt that this great movement will quicken activity and create wealth and power in California and Oregon, I leave them to consider what changes the movements, similar in nature but inferior in force and slower in effect, have produced already on the Atlantic coast of America. As to those who can not see how this movement will improve the condition of Asia I leave them to reflect upon the improvements in the country of Europe since the discovery and colonization of America. Who does not see, then, that every year hereafter European commerce, European politics, European thoughts, and European activity, although actually gaining greater force—and European connections, although actually becoming more intimate—will, nevertheless, relatively sink in importance, while the Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and the vast regions beyond will become the chief theater of events in the world's great hereafter? * * *

Commerce is the great agent of this movement. Whatever nation shall put that commerce into full employment and shall conduct it steadily with adequate expansion will become necessarily the greatest of existing states; greater than any that has ever existed. Sir, you will claim that responsibility and that high destiny for our own country. * * *

We have coal and iron * * *, while corn, timber, cattle, hemp, wool, cotton, silk, oil, sugar, and the grape, quicksilver, lead, copper, silver, and gold are all found within our own broad domain in inexhaustible profusion. What energies we have already expended prove that we have in reserve all that are needful. What inventions we have made prove our equality to any exigency. Our capital increases, while labor scarcely knows the burden of taxation. Our Panama route to China has a decided advantage over that of the Isthmus of Suez, and at the same time vessels leaving that country and coming around the Horn will reach New York always at least five days sooner than vessels of equal speed can double the Cape of Good Hope, and make the port of Liverpool. * * *

Mr. President, we now see how conspicuous a part in the great movement of the age California and Oregon are to sustain, and that, as yet, they are separated from us and isolated. They will adhere to us only so long as our government over them shall be conducted, not for our benefit but for their own. Their loyalty is great, but it can not exceed that of the thirteen ancient American Colonies to Great Britain; and yet the neglect and oppression of their commerce undermined that loyalty, and resulted in their independence. I hear often of dangers to the Union, and see lines of threatened separation drawn by passionate men or alarmists, on parallels of latitude; but, in my judgment, there is only one danger of severance, and that is involved in the possibility of criminal neglect of the new communities on the Pacific coast, while the summits of the Rocky Mountains and of the Snowy Mountains mark the only possible line of dismemberment. Against that danger I would guard as against the worst calamity that could befall, not only my country, at her most auspicious stage of progress, but mankind also, in the hour of their brightest hopes. I would guard against it by practicing impartial justice toward the new and remote States and Territories,

whose political power is small, while their wants are great, and by pursuing at the same time, with liberality and constancy, the lofty course which they indicate, of an aspiring yet generous and humane national ambition.

[Reprinted from the National Republic, Washington, D. C.]

THE RISE OF THE PACIFIC—IT IS RAPIDLY BECOMING THE GREATEST HIGHWAY OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE AND BRINGING WITH IT PROSPERITY AND PROGRESS FOR OUR WESTERN PORTS

By FRANKLIN F. KORELL, Representative in Congress from Oregon

The quotation to the effect that the course of empire is ever westward has become embodied in our everyday American speech as firmly as many of the best-known sayings of Shakespeare. It is true, too, because ever since Father Abraham moved out from Ur of the Chaldees the tide of migration and progress has been westward. There came the Empire of Persia, then Greece, then Rome, and the countries of western Europe, but the tide did not stop here. Christopher Columbus and his hardy adventurers sailed westward across the great ocean and discovered the New World. Soon the pioneers were settling the Western Hemisphere and discovering the untold riches embraced within its bosom.

In a few generations commerce on the Atlantic surpassed that on the Mediterranean which had been the principal highway up to that time. Again the tide of human progress swept westward. It continued to roll across the American continent until to-day we see the great Pacific coming into its own, although it has been only a little more than a hundred years since its sea-borne commerce assumed any importance. In time the Pacific will undoubtedly surpass the Atlantic in commerce, just as the Atlantic a few centuries ago went ahead of the Mediterranean.

In the prophetic words of Theodore Roosevelt: "The Mediterranean era died with the discovery of America; the Atlantic era has reached the height of its development; the Pacific era, destined to be the greatest, is just at the dawn."

There is a reason for this prophecy. In addition to the great Pacific slope of the United States, the great ocean touches the coasts of Japan, China, Asiatic Russia, the Philippines, South America, Alaska, Hawaii, Australia, New Zealand, Africa, Central America, and Canada. It makes possible increased commerce between the United States and all of these countries. Through the Panama Canal, too, there has been opened up a better communication between our western coast and Cuba, the West Indies, and Europe.

The various sectors of the Asiatic side of the Pacific basin have an area of seven and one-half million square miles, compared with two and three-quarter million square miles that make up the American side. This amounts to slightly more than one-fifth of the land surface of the globe. The land area of the Pacific basin is one-third larger than the continent of North America and has a population equal that of North America and Europe combined. In fact, this area holds all told nearly one-third of the earth's combined population—540,000,000 people on the Asiatic side and 23,000,000 on the American side.

The 11 States included within the western division of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and of course including Hawaii, are California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Nevada, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Idaho. In 1913 the population of this district was approximately seven and three-fourths million people; in 1926, slightly more than 11,000,000 people—a gain in population during that period of some 40 per cent. In fact, the growth of population on the Pacific coast in recent years has been five times greater than the increase on the Atlantic coast.

There is an explanation for this and reason for the continuing westward flow of civilization. This Pacific region produces three and one-half billion dollars worth of farm products every year. It contains 50 per cent of the standing merchantable timber of the United States, and cuts lumber valued at \$550,000,000 a year, employing in this industry 225,000 persons. It is one of the great fruit-growing, stock-raising, dairying, and poultry sections of the world, and contains vast deposits of ore and minerals, much coal, and large subterranean lakes of oil. The great length of this region and the various elevations of altitude permit the raising of all kinds of fruits and farm products.

This region contains 72 per cent of the potential water power in the United States. It can well be said that its vast water supply will bring forth new wealth from a fertile soil; that its coal, oil, and water power will generate inexhaustible power for manufacturing purposes. Nowhere in all the world is the future more replete with hope for the unlimited expansion of farming, industry, and manufacturing.

Last, but not least, it may be said while on this phase of the subject that Oregon, Washington, and Alaska are the world's largest fisheries, producing wealth of about \$85,000,000 a year.

Although the development of Pacific coast commerce has been steady, it was greatly enhanced by the opening of the Panama Canal in 1914 and by two events of great importance occurring in the year 1898. These were the Battle of Manila Bay, which brought about ultimately the annexation of the Philippine Islands to the United States, and the formal incorporation of the Hawaiian Islands as an American Territory.

The opening of the canal, of course, greatly facilitated commerce between the Atlantic and the Pacific, and the acquisition of the islands in the Pacific made the United States a world power.

In 1913 Uncle Sam supplied about 32 per cent of Pacific Latin American imports. Great Britain's share was 21 per cent and Germany's 19 per cent. In 1925 the proportion of the United States was 50 per cent, while England's share had fallen to 15 per cent and Germany's to 10 per cent. Uncle Sam is now the principal supplier of products to every country in South America with the exception of Paraguay.

In the days before the opening of the canal the far countries of the Pacific sent us about 12 per cent of our total imports and took about 7 per cent of our exports. Now they send us about 30 per cent of our imports and take about 15 per cent of our exports. In the words of the Washington Post, "Japan is a better customer of this country than France, Italy, Argentina, or Australia. Only three other nations take a greater volume of American exports. Nearly 10 per cent of our imports come from Japan. That country is second only to Canada as a source of supply for American markets." The experts have found out that if we could increase China's per capita imports from the United States to equal Japan's, this would mean an increase of \$6,000,000,000 over China's present total of \$600,000,000.

In 1929 our total sales to customers amounted to \$5,128,400,000 worth of commodities. Compare this world trade with our potential exports to China, if the day ever arrives, and it surely will, when China shall have a stable government and become a prosperous nation.

America's trade with Canada is now three times that of 1913. The sugar production of Hawaii in 1902 was, in round figures, 356,000 tons; in 1928 it was 904,000 tons. In 1902 practically no pineapples were packed; in 1928, 8,633,000 cases of 24 cans each were packed. The sugar crop in 1928 had a value of approximately \$95,000,000, and the pineapple pack of 1928 was worth approximately \$39,594,090, a clear gain over 1902. The value of the principal exports from the United States to Hawaii in 1928 was \$77,824,000 and comprised a tremendous variety of things, a list far too long and too varied to even attempt to mention.

The increase of our Pacific trade as compared with the expansion of our Atlantic commerce is indicated in a recent report of the Secretary of Commerce which says: "The changes in the geographic distribution of our export sales during the fiscal year just closed were for the most part in the same direction as those of other recent years. Exports to Europe increased only 3 per cent, partly by reason of the actual decline in sales of grain to that Continent, while to all the rest of the world we sold 16½ per cent more in value than in 1927-28. The continent showing the greatest increase was Asia, 20½ per cent. But to no great trade region outside of Europe was the increase less than about 11 per cent. It is to be expected that after manufactured goods became more important in our foreign sales, the gain in exports shall be chiefly in trade with countries as yet little developed in manufacturing industries."

The reason for the rising importance of the Pacific as an international highway will be indicated by some slight insight into the progress made by our 11 Western States. The total value of the products of agriculture for that district rose from \$562,000,000 in 1909 to \$1,694,846,000 in 1928. The value of mineral products increased from \$354,000,000 in 1909 to \$1,046,000,000 in 1928. But most noteworthy of all is the fact that the value of the manufactured products increased from \$1,208,000,000 in 1909 to \$4,595,102,000 in 1927.

In 1900 the total exports from our Pacific coast ports amounted to \$69,608,329. In 1928 the value had grown to \$557,860,000. Imports coming to our Pacific coast ports in 1900 were valued at \$58,401,381. In 1928 the value of imports was \$493,775,000. In 1928 the Pacific coast's combined volume of exports and imports exclusive of Hawaii and Alaska amounted to \$1,051,635,000, which was nearly ten times that of 1900 and three times that of 1913. In 1913 our Western States exported to the foreign Pacific area \$79,973,295 worth of goods, and imported \$133,004,055 worth of commodities. In 1928 the value of the exports to these same countries had amounted to \$262,908,000, and the imports had grown to \$351,430,000. The total volume of our trade with France in 1928 was \$399,400,000. The total volume of our trade with Japan was \$672,354,000. These figures give some idea of the significance of our trade in the Pacific area.

The total exports of the United States as a whole in 1928 to Asia and Oceania amounted to \$834,547,000, and the imports of the United States as a whole from those sections of the Pacific area amounted to \$1,222,378,000, nearly 50 per cent greater than the amount of our exports. It is to be noted, however, that the total of the imports has greatly increased by certain commodities that we are not yet able to produce for ourselves, as notably, rubber. This makes a total value of trade between the United States, Asia, and Oceania about \$2,056,925,000.

The rise of the Pacific also spells increasing progress and prosperity for our own great Pacific ports—San Francisco, Seattle, Los Angeles, and Portland. It may be said, too, that the port of San Diego is one of growing importance, and the same is true of Tacoma.

I am naturally proud of my own city of Portland and its harbor and port. In 1850 Portland was a village of a few hundred inhabitants, accessible only to vessels of light draft. To-day it has an estimated

population of over 364,000 and is one of the major ports of the Pacific. The harbor proper is formed by the Willamette River, has a width of from 900 to 1,600 feet, and affords nearly 27 miles of water frontage, a great deal of which is now occupied by public and private terminals, grain, oil, and lumber wharves, grain elevators, dry docks, and shipyards. It has a least channel depth of 30 feet at low water, and a new project for a 35-foot low-water depth has been adopted. The Federal project for the 30-foot depth ship channel from Portland to the Pacific has been completed for several years.

Portland is the primary wheat exporting port of the Pacific coast, and this important grain constitutes the principal item of export. Other exports are lumber, apples, flour, canned goods, and paper. The continued gain in domestic imports is indicative of the growth of Portland as a jobbing and distributing center. The total tonnage of ocean traffic in and out of Portland in 1929 was 5,554,709, but there was in addition a large volume of inland water or river traffic amounting in 1927 to more than 4,000,000 tons.

Seattle is one of the famous ports of the Pacific coast. The port of Seattle has an outer salt-water harbor and an inner or fresh-water harbor. It is in the outer harbor that most of Seattle's shipping is conducted. Seattle is one of the most progressive cities in the country, and has an estimated population of not far from 400,000.

In 1919 the water-borne commerce of Seattle was 5,496,666 tons, with a value of \$750,071,971. In 1929 the total number of tons had grown to 9,167,475. The port has expended during the last 15 years approximately \$10,000,000 in developing the existing system of harbor terminals.

The historic port of the Pacific coast is San Francisco, a city which now has a population of more than 750,000 within the city and county limits.

The San Francisco Harbor includes 450 square miles of water and is one of the finest landlocked harbors in the world. So much has been said of the beautiful Golden Gate in song and story that it is not necessary to take any space here in attempting a description of it.

In the year 1929, 7,806 ships arrived in the port of San Francisco, and there were 7,959 departures. The value of the commerce of San Francisco with foreign countries in 1929 was \$423,000,000, an increase of 13 per cent over 1927.

The port of Los Angeles is a modern achievement. The harbor towns of San Pedro and Wilmington were annexed to the city in 1909, and Los Angeles promised to spend in the 10 years following \$10,000,000 in harbor improvements. In 1910, the following year, the Government completed the breakwater of over 2 miles in length at a cost of \$3,100,000. Then the real growth and progress of Los Angeles Harbor commenced.

The actual construction of channels and terminals began in 1912 and the first municipal wharf was completed in 1914.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, Los Angeles Harbor handled over 2,000,000 tons of cargo, valued at a little more than \$76,000,000, and 2,787 vessels entered the port. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, the harbor handled over 26,099,245 tons of cargo valued at over \$1,038,380,246, and 7,888 vessels entered the port.

Los Angeles leads in the export of canned fish, petroleum, oils, and in the import of lumber.

In this brief article I have attempted to give the readers of the National Republic some idea of the rapid growth of the Pacific States and the rise in the importance of the Pacific in our foreign trade.

In conclusion, I shall quote a few paragraphs from Dr. Julius Klein, the efficient Assistant Secretary of Commerce, who has the following to say about our Pacific trade:

"A study of the import statistics of Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and Chile, generally designated as the west coast countries of South America, show constantly increasing imports, with a steadily mounting share from the United States. In 1913 total imports into these countries amounted to \$177,819,482, of which 18.2 per cent originated in the United States; in 1924 total imports had risen to \$237,723,115, of which 29.6 came from the United States; of total imports valued at \$256,669,123 in 1925, 31.9 per cent were from the United States; and 1926 figures show total imports of \$262,529,959, with 36 per cent coming from this country.

"The Pacific Coast States have shared extensively in this expanding market, shipments thereto from the ports of Oregon, Washington, and California having increased 238 per cent between 1913 and 1926, or from less than \$4,500,000 in the former year to more than \$15,000,000 in the latter. In view of the fact that total imports into these four west coast countries of South America were only 47 per cent greater in 1926 than in 1913 and that total imports from the United States increased 192 per cent, the increase of 238 per cent from the Pacific Coast States is particularly significant. The outlook in this market for Pacific coast products is exceptionally bright."

Dr. Julius Klein also states, in an article on Our New Trade Frontier in the Orient, that:

"Before the World War (in 1913) our commerce—exports and imports—with these lands from New Zealand around to Japan and westward to India totaled, in round figures, \$462,000,000. This represented just under 12 per cent of our total imports and just under 7 per cent of our total exports."

"Last year we did a business with the Orient of \$2,215,000,000, of which \$1,443,000,000 represented imports and \$772,000,000 represented exports. This import trade now constitutes 30 per cent of our total imports, and our exports to the Far East have increased to 14.6 per cent of our total exports. In no other part of the world have we made such rapid advances in the development of both import and export trade as we have with the countries of the Far East. Not only has the actual volume of the trade increased many fold but the proportion of our world commerce represented by it has more than doubled.

"Industrially also the Orient has been awakening, and in those lines where unskilled labor may be utilized to advantage, some degree of success has been attained. Japan, for example, has developed a large cotton-textile industry; India has done the same, and in China over 5,000,000 spindles are in operation, of which more than 3,000,000 are Chinese owned. The Far East now employs tens of thousands of workers in its mills and the new purchasing power represented by its mills and the new purchasing power represented by their earnings is expanding steadily. India has in Bengal a world center for jute production, and is developing slowly but successfully an iron and steel industry.

"Even more important than these considerations is the fact that this new economic advance across the Pacific will afford a new outlet for the many varieties of special machinery, replacements, and supplies which America is so well qualified to provide. Our sales of machinery to this region in 1926 reached the impressive total of \$72,000,000—and this is just a beginning. Furthermore, this factory development involves the payment of wages which yield a higher income to thousands of native population than they would otherwise receive, and it has already had the effect of increasing their purchasing power noticeably.

"These factors have already resulted in remarkable developments in the sale of small luxuries to the Far East, which are now being distributed in areas where poverty has heretofore precluded their being marketed.

"There is some evidence that the trade lines of the future will knit the United States most closely with the relatively near-by countries of China and Japan, where we have the advantage of proximity, as compared with the European nations, and where our progress is unimpeded by the preference of colonies for the goods of their mother countries. It is to Japan and China that we shall be shipping the major portion of our sales to the Orient, and our purchases from them promise to continue at a heavy rate."

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief statement on the life and character of Thomas Jefferson.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an article on the life of Thomas Jefferson. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article on Thomas Jefferson, I submit the following very inspiring and illuminating article sent out to-day by the Hon. Jouett Shouse, executive secretary of the Democratic National Committee:

"AT EVERY VIBRATION BETWEEN THE POINTS OF LIBERTY AND DESPOTISM, SOMETHING WILL BE GAINED BY THE FORMER

There would have been no United States of America if it had not been for Thomas Jefferson. It was his genius that found a way to reconcile the differences among the thirteen American States and make possible a political union to replace the loose federation of interests that fought the Revolutionary War.

Had it not been for the certainty of the views of the founder of the Democratic Party and the compelling logic of his philosophy, we would have had either the monarchical system of Hamilton's dream or the eastern part of the United States might have paralleled the stormy history of Central America, instead of developing into the great, powerful, homogeneous country with a teeming national consciousness that was the fulfillment of Jefferson's vision. Had it not been for Jefferson, all of the country west of the Mississippi and all south of the Carolinas would, in all probability, still be foreign territory.

At every stage of the progress of the transformation of a number of jealous, contentious Commonwealths with different histories, divergent views, and opposing interests into a united nation, we discover the hand of Jefferson skillfully finding the answers to hard questions and devising processes of reconciliation.

It is interesting to trace the story of the intellectual evolution of the great statesman from the awkward boy, left to his own devices at the age of 14. He was at school—a queer school, according to our modern ideas—conducted by teachers whose shortcomings were plain to the precocious youngster who had the wisdom and determination to shift to a new educational environment as soon as possible. Then we see him at the university, likewise a strange institution, with its theological emphasis and its Indian annex—thrown in with boys following the British tradition of having as good a time as possible, and incidentally gath-

ering only enough book learning to qualify them for the lives of country gentlemen.

Our Jefferson was comfortable, but not wealthy. The histories tell us that it was quite a drag on his estate to find the hundred pounds a year—his university course cost.

Some strain of the thrifty, careful yeomanry of his paternal ancestors gave him an infinite capacity for taking pains. His diaries and notebooks testify to the meticulous attention he gave to recording events, so there is hardly a day of his life of which we have not the complete story—from the recording of the sixpences he spent to the conferences on which the fate of the Nation depended.

And through it all, he never veered from his basic thought of preserving the fullest measure of individual liberty and holding the powers of government as near as possible to their source—the people themselves. With this theory, naturally, went the principle of retaining for the States all authority they did not specifically bestow on the Federal establishment.

That was warp and woof of the whole governmental fabric he was engaged in weaving; the basis of our first fundamental controversy; the issue on which Jefferson and Hamilton contested through the years of the Nation's beginnings.

Through Jefferson's long public life, he never abated in his regard of State rights as the corner stone of our liberties. He was vehement on the subject when the Constitution was forming, and we find him after he had retired from the Presidency still warning his fellow-citizens that "the States should be watchful to note every material usurpation of their rights; denounce them as they occur in the most peremptory terms, protest against them as wrongs to which our present submission shall be considered, not as acknowledgments or precedents of right, but as a temporary yielding to the lesser evil."

Jefferson was a bookworm always, and, strange for that sort of a character, he was the strongest man physically in his section of the country and endowed with a courage and capacity for prompt decisions which suggests a soldier rather than a student. Unconsciously, the boy's poring over volumes and manuscripts was fitting him for his place in history, for it was his knowledge of experiments in government—and the tragic archives of misgovernment—that enabled him to put his finger on the weak places of the innumerable plans for the nascent nation, to point the true way—probably the only way—that America could fulfill its destiny.

His was perhaps the most consistent life of which we have the full story. From college to the practice of law and the administration of his estate; membership in the Virginia House of Burgesses, where his insistence on the then novel theory of the inalienable rights of man played so strong a part in Virginia's prominence in resistance to British tyranny; membership in the Continental Congress; Governor of Virginia, succeeding Patrick Henry; his embassy to France; membership in Washington's Cabinet, where as Secretary of State with but four aides he did the work now divided among half a dozen departments; his Vice Presidency, his two terms as President; and the sunset of his life as a revered philosopher; he never changed. The mainspring of the whole Jefferson system was his insistence that in the end political wisdom rested with the people, and at the close of it all he chose these three things to be placed on his tombstone:

"The authorship of the Declaration of Independence, the writing of the Statute for Religious Liberty, and the founding of the University of Virginia."

It may seem incongruous a century later to think that a man, whose achievements were so many and so great, should deem that the enactment of a statute for so simple a principle as that men should worship according to their own consciences should be so set out, but it was anything but a commonplace in those days. Jefferson's Virginia was still putting Quakers in the stocks and discriminating against Baptists, and there was still on the statute books a law assessing the death penalty for an offender who three times disobeyed the mandates of the clergy of the Established English Church to attend divine service.

Of course, Jefferson was not always successful. He was too much ahead of his time to marshal all the thought of his day to march with him. Though a slave-holder himself, he recognized the danger to the country that lay in that institution, and sought its gradual extirpation. Away back in his days as a burgess, we find him introducing a measure for the repeal of a Virginia law that threw difficulties in the way of a planter who wanted to free his slaves.

It is curious to note the definiteness of his views on problems which most of us think of as being entirely new. For example, we find him 130 years ago fulminating against the dilution of executive responsibility through the use of commissions.

"Responsibility," he wrote at that time, "is a tremendous engine in free government. Let him [the Executive] feel the full weight of it by taking away the shelter of his executive council." And 15 years later we find him still protesting against "the screen of a council behind which to escape from responsibility."

He was intensely practical, despite the criticism he incurred in his own time of being a star-gazing theorist and idealist. For example, during his ministry in France, when he was striving to remedy the desperate condition of American trade, so necessary to get the new

Nation really under way, he sought to bring about free trade in American tobacco, only to be confronted with the statement that the tobacco business was a monopoly of the King, the American end of which was handled by his friend, Robert Morris, who was the only person who could lawfully send a pound of tobacco to France. Jefferson suggested that he did not wish to have the King's revenue renounced, but only that the monopoly should be put down, which he suggested might be "effected in the simplest manner by obliging the importers to pay on entrance a duty equal to what the King received or to deposit the tobacco in the King's warehouse until it was paid." He succeeded to the extent of gaining the agreement that the Morris contract would not be renewed, and he also managed to help New England by obtaining the admission of whale oil from Nantucket into France, while barring that of European whale fishers.

He was always doing these practical things.

The Italians had a rice so good that it drove the American rice out of the European market. Strict laws prohibited the export of any of the seed, so we find Jefferson, the American dignitary and philosopher, filling his pockets with it and sending it to Charleston, where it was distributed to the rice planters, a dozen or two grains to each, and from those pocketfuls of seed rice is descended the American rice of to-day.

Jefferson also invented the dollar; that is, he devised the decimal system of currency to take the place of the awkward business of pounds, shillings, and pence, which we inherited from the mother country.

He knew how to compromise, and because of that capacity the Capital of the United States is now at Washington. There were two controversies raging when Jefferson was Secretary of State—one as to the location of the Capital and the other on the assumption of the States debts, growing out of the Revolution, by the National Government. There was even a prospect of the Confederation breaking up over this question. New York and New England wanted the Capital to be at Rights Ferry on the Susquehanna. The Southern States combated this. Germantown and other places were suggested as alternatives.

The Southern States resisted the transfer of the war debts to the Federal Government. Some of them had paid partially as the debts were incurred; there was objection to bearing the burdens incurred by expeditions not authorized by Washington; there was the complication of dubious speculation in depreciated currency. Both sides were hinting at secession. Jefferson got the champions of both these propositions to dine with him at his house at Maiden Lane, and the result was that in exchange for the southern votes for assumption of the States debts was given the southern location of the Capital.

Another of Jefferson's dinners resulted in the principle that there should be no warships on the Great Lakes and no fortifications on the long frontier between us and Canada. This was the dinner at which the first British ambassador to the United States was the sole guest, and, talking over the vexed question of when, if ever, Great Britain would surrender the frontier ports, such as that at Detroit, it was the ambassador's suggestion that neither party have any forts, but trading posts only, "which," said Jefferson, "accorded well with two ideas of mine of leaving commerce free and never keeping unnecessary soldiers."

Jefferson's 44 years in public life enriched the country but impoverished himself. The embargo which he proclaimed as President destroyed the market for produce of his farms to such an extent that in his old age a public subscription only saved Monticello for him. He carried out his principle of never permitting his offices to aid his personal fortunes, to an extent that seems unbelievable in this day when nobody is surprised to find a high official studying the stock market reports. When he was Secretary of State his old friend and secretary asked him for advice as to the disposition of a little stock, to which he replied: "Were I to advise your agent (who is himself a stock dealer) to sell out yours at this or that moment it would be used as a signal to guide speculation."

Invited to share in an investment that promised almost a certainty of profit, he declined on the ground that a public man must preserve his mind free from all possible bias of interest.

Nowadays the Vice Presidential office is the subject of all manner of jests because of the lack of adequate employment as second highest official in the land, but when Jefferson attained to that office by virtue of having three electoral votes fewer than John Adams he found plenty to do. Among other things, he devoted himself to the Manual of Parliamentary Practice, which is still the basis of procedure in the Congress. Perhaps the most startling thing in it is "When the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question he is to withdraw."

He and President Adams, being on opposite sides, though at that time close personal friends, Jefferson was given a small part in the actual administration. In fact, one of the historians records that President Adams never consulted the Vice President on political matters after Madison had declined the French mission, the proffer of which was Adams's last effort to disregard the principle established by Washington of ignoring party distinctions in his appointments. The next time there was a consultation on political matters—for the punctuality of their official relations was never interrupted—was four years later,

when Adams had been defeated for reelection and Jefferson and Aaron Burr were tied for the office and the House of Representatives was determining the succession. Jefferson called on the President, asking him to negative a congressional proposal that the President of the Senate should conduct the Government in the event that the tie was not dissolved before the expiration of Adams's term, pointing out that that was an unconstitutional expedient and might result in revolution.

Adams demurred, saying that Jefferson could himself fix the election by promising that he would not turn out the Federalists from office, put down the Navy, or wipe off the public debt. Jefferson had no mind to do any of these things, but, as he told Gouverneur Morris, who had made that proposal to him on behalf of the Federalists, the country would have to decide from his record in public office what course he meant to pursue, "believing it to be my duty," he said, "to be passive and silent during the present régime; that I should certainly make no terms, should never go into the office of President by capitulation, nor with my hands tied by any condition which would hinder me from pursuing the measures which I should deem for the public good."

The eight years during which Jefferson was President of the United States demonstrated to the country that the Democratic ideals for which he had fought through his whole career were neither glittering generalities nor impractical dreams. He began his administration by pardoning all who had been imprisoned for violation of the sedition laws, because, as he phrased it, he considered that law to be "a nullity as absolute and palpable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image; and that it was as much my duty to arrest its execution at every stage as it would have been to rescue from the fiery furnace those who had been cast into it for refusing to worship the image." It was accordingly done in every instance without asking what the offenders had done or against whom they had offended, but whether the pains they were suffering were inflicted under the pretended sedition law.

It had been argued that Jefferson's interpretation of the doctrine of State rights would result in nullification and confusion. Perhaps no administration has been as free from conflict along these lines as was his.

Insisting always that the division between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government should be strictly observed, he nevertheless led the country successfully through the complications and dangers that beset the young Nation through the period of the Napoleonic wars, which time after time threatened to involve us in a world struggle of that day. He did not hesitate to let Great Britain know that we would join actively in the general war then supposed to be impending if England seized New Orleans. He gave France the same warning when he heard that Spain was ceding Louisiana and Florida to France. He let France understand that if she attempted to take possession of New Orleans "it seals the union of two nations who in conjunction can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean. From that moment we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation." The result of all of which was that Louisiana became American territory at a price of \$15,000,000.

Jefferson also had the satisfaction of relieving the world of the exactions of the Barbary pirates. Like every other country, the United States had paid millions to ransom its citizens who had been seized and enslaved. As our envoy in Paris, he had himself negotiated such ransoms. But that all ended when Jefferson sent Decatur with his three frigates and sloop to the Mediterranean.

The end of Jefferson's administration saw the democratic principle so firmly established that federalism in its old sense really ceased to exist in this country. He was one of those few Presidents who, had he desired it, could have had a third term, for the whole country now acclaimed his administrations. He waved that aside, as had Washington before him. And yet no President was so abused before he came into office as he. The country was told that he hated the Constitution and was pledged to subvert it; that he would tumble the country into ruin in one stroke and bring on bankruptcy and distress; that he would dismantle the Navy. Perhaps the most moral man who has ever attained to the headship of the Nation, he was accused from the pulpit of robbing a widow and fatherless children of £10,000 intrusted to him by his grandfather's will. They called him an atheist, profane philosopher, and an infidel, and accused him of every sort of personal impurity and immorality. He never complained of this any more than he did of criticism when he was President. He retired to Monticello, issuing no denials or protests, and, incidentally, invented the revolving desk chair.

When somebody commented on the absence of bitterness under the snowstorm of defamation, he merely smiled and replied that the defamation did not apply to him, for, he said, there never was a Thomas Jefferson such as they described.

Perhaps the greatest shock of all his term was his abolition of the heavy court etiquette that surrounded the Chief Magistrate. He did away, for example, with the weekly levee not altogether because it was too reminiscent of court but because it took up too much time. During his term the White House was open to the public but twice a year—on July 4 and on New Year's Day. His dinners had no more of state

than those of a private citizen. He lived up to his code that the President was merely a citizen performing a particular function to which he had been chosen. He never bothered during his first term to make deals or devise schemes to get the second, and he went out of office the same modest gentleman that he was when he entered.

It was to Jefferson that we owe not only the basic principles of democracy but the demonstration that they are practical and that under them a nation thrives and prospers as under no other system. For more than a century they have been under fire by those who seek to make government a means of profit to themselves.

In war his pen was the complement of Washington's sword; in peace he not only led his country politically but intellectually. The bill of rights, the dignity of the citizen, freedom of religion, of speech, and of the press were among his contributions to the science of morals and of government. The strict separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government was his constant anxiety; reposing the power to inaugurate revenue measure in the House of Congress nearest to the people, so that the taxing power should never become an asset of tyranny, was one of the many things he took from the British system—the whole history of government was his field when he came to form a Constitution for the United States, and he gleaned the best wherever he found it.

He engaged in no wars, but could hardly be described as a pacifist in the modern sense, for, in the process of steering the then frail bark of nationality through the stormy waters of the Napoleonic era, he did not hesitate to show that he would fight to attain and maintain his country's desires if they were threatened by the mutations of the European struggles.

In a period when duelling was part of the system of his social order he fought no duels; though the leading figure of the fiercest controversy in the country's history, no adversary sought to challenge him to defend his position with pistol or sword, with both of which he was familiar. Perhaps the reason for this may be found in his overwhelming sense of justice, his capacity to see what was defensible in his opponent's position, and his willingness to credit him with as much sincerity as he had himself. To him recrimination was a waste of time. Though assailed by every foul charge and malicious innuendo to which his adversaries could lay tongue or pen, he stuck to the merits of whatever issue he was advocating or combating, for, as he explained, the question was everything and the character of the advocate nothing.

The story of our country is the story of the defense of the principles established by our first great Democrat, for every attempt to turn the agencies of government to personal advantage involves an assault on Jefferson's code.

"Soberly," said Abraham Lincoln, "It is no child's play to save the principles of Jefferson from total overthrow in this Nation. The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society."

CRITICISMS OF CONGRESSMEN

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all honest men invite constructive criticisms. No one appreciates a destructive one. All people who attempt anything worth while are bombarded with all kinds of criticism. Public officials come in for their share of criticisms and when they offer for reelection they generally get more than their share. A political campaign, on a high plane when all parties wage a contest of constructive criticisms upon the merits of the real public issues, is always helpful and desirable. The people are enabled to select their officials after giving due and proper consideration to the merits of each contestant as developed by their position on matters of public concern. I know of no public official who is more anxious for fair, constructive criticisms than the average Member of Congress; and yet probably no one receives quite so few helpful, fair criticisms or quite so many destructive unfair criticisms.

There are several reasons for this. One of the foremost is that the labors of Members of Congress, in most cases, are performed hundreds and even thousands of miles from their constituents and it is so easy for our enemies to make charges which our friends back home, of their own knowledge, do not know to be untrue. Our people see our State and county officials at work. Not so with us. All the information they get about our efforts here, is from correspondence, newspapers, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and from what is said about us by those who come here and behold our labors. Thus it is that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the chief source of information. People as a whole learn more about our work from the RECORD than from any other medium. Newspapers and others may misrepresent Congress and the Members but the RECORD states the truth.

This is the reason many wish there was no RECORD and object to Members mailing parts of it to their people back home.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the shield and armor of the common people and the defender of their representatives in Congress. Without it, great corporate wealth could so control the big newspapers as to destroy any one who would not do their will and be their slave and the Congressman, with modest means, could not make reply. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the right to mail it free is a mighty bulwark of the liberties of our people, and puts the representative of the common people in position to defend his people and himself against unfair subsidized newspaper propaganda.

I wish I could mail the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to all the voters in my district, but I can not. It would cost me about \$2,000 a month to do this. I must content myself with paying about a thousand dollars per year to send out a part of my own remarks and speeches. I wish I was able to send them all out.

Contrary to what many believe, the Members pay for the printing of their speeches when they mail them out. The postage, though, is free. If it was not free, the rich man or the man with big campaign boodle would have the advantage of the poor Member who is too honest to take a bribe or sell out for large campaign donations. Many complain bitterly because Members of Congress can mail parts of the RECORD free.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and parts of the RECORD are mailed free so Members of Congress can let their people know just what they are doing here. It is the duty of the Member to make reports to his people from time to time. The franking privilege enables the Member to do his duty by his folks. The free-mail privilege does not belong to the Congressman. It is the right of the people. It can only be exercised by the Member in official matters. It can only be used for the service of the public.

Mr. Speaker, the Member who is everlastingly on the job uses in behalf of his people every ounce of his energy and every weapon at his command. He strives to overcome every obstacle that would harm his district and Nation and wages a never-tiring, relentless warfare by speeches before committees and on the floor, by putting his remarks and the remarks of others in the RECORD when he can not get time to deliver or read them, and by seeking to overcome in every way possible those who with every weapon at their command are fighting him.

Those who criticize the use of the RECORD, just simply do not know the facts, and if they were here and did their duty would use the RECORD and every known legitimate means in behalf of their people back home just as the conscientious Member here does. The men here who make the most speeches and do the most work also put in the RECORD the most remarks of themselves and others when they believe by so doing they can help the cause of their people.

It has always been thus, and always will be. At this time I shall only mention a few more unfair criticisms. It is grossly unfair to criticize all of Congress for what a few Members may or may not do. For instance, if a few Members should fail to be faithful to their people, all should not be blamed for the acts of the few.

Again, it is not fair to criticize the minority, because the majority outvotes them and passes bad legislation, such as sometimes happens when the Democrats are in control, and which is almost invariably the case when the Republicans are in power.

Another most unfair thrust at any efficient, loyal Member of Congress is for some one in his district to say "the district needs an honest, sober, able man in Congress at this time," thus indirectly, by insinuation and innuendo, accusing the Member in office with being a dishonest, drunken weakling. This kind of a charge is sometimes made against a Member by people who would not dare charge the Member directly with being either crooked, drunken, or crazy. They dare not make a false statement directly, but will and do make it indirectly.

Mr. Speaker, the unfair criticism, though, that was ever made of a Member of Congress, or of anyone else, is for some one in criticizing the Member or individual to circulate a mere rumor or hearsay statement which would not be received in any court of justice as evidence and which in most probability is not at all true. Criticisms are often very proper, but they are never proper, but vicious and cowardly, when the one making them of his own knowledge does not know them to be true, and when they are very probably false.

In conclusion, let me say Members of Congress should be criticized and they invite fair criticism. There are thousands upon tens of thousands of pages of written record, here, telling correctly of their bills, votes, attendance, speeches, and services in every respect. This is the record that should be criticized if anyone finds a flaw in it and can offer something better. Many brush this record aside with the statement "he has done nothing." This is unfair. A man can not remain in Congress in good health and do nothing. He either votes or does not; makes speeches or remains silent; answers roll call or is absent playing golf or attending a show; either appears before com-

mittees or does not; either introduces and fights for bills or does not; and in fact he is very loyal to his people or in effect is a traitor to their best interest or he is somewhere between these extremes. I am sure most Members of Congress rather have a race without so much talk about rumors and what some one whispered to another, all of which generally is untrue or at least distorted and misleading. They would much prefer an open, fair discussion of their true merits and services as disclosed by the daily printed official RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—FARM ORGANIZATION AND THE DEBENTURE PLAN

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the failure of legislation enacted by this Congress to stabilize the price of agricultural products, to give the farmer the benefit of the protective tariff, and to place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with other industries as promised by both political parties in the campaign preceding the last national election, the following letter from the National Grange is particularly pertinent at this stage of the consideration of the pending tariff bill:

MARCH 26, 1930.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Until recent weeks, we had hoped that the tariff bill might be revised in the Senate in such manner as to meet the needs of agriculture. But, in all frankness, it is necessary to say that the rates in the bill which has just been passed by the Senate and sent to conference, fall far short of placing agriculture on a basis of equality with industry, as was promised in the last presidential campaign. It is also true that the bill is not in accord with the recommendations contained in the message of President Hoover at the opening of the special session of Congress, last April.

It will be recalled that the President advocated only a limited revision of the industrial schedules, remarking that it was not as if we were setting up a new basis of protective duties for industry. There was peculiar force and truth in his comment that this had been done when the Fordney-McCumber bill was enacted. The industrial rates then established, and still in effect, are admittedly the highest tariff rates in our history. That these rates, on the whole, are effective is attested by the fact that less than 5 per cent of the manufactured products consumed in this country are imported.

Under all the circumstances, and particularly in view of the depressed condition of agriculture, it has been astonishing that industry should demand still higher rates in connection with a revision of the tariff undertaken primarily to give agriculture parity with the other groups composing our industrial system.

Keeping in mind the fact that agriculture is at a disadvantage, as compared with industry, under the Fordney-McCumber bill it must be manifest to any impartial observer that under a plan of revision granting four times as many increases in rates to industry as to agriculture the disparity which we undertook to correct still remains.

From the broad standpoint of national welfare it must certainly be said that we have drifted far from the sane and reasonable attitude toward the tariff which was enunciated by President McKinley in his last public utterance. In the memorable address which he delivered at the Pan American Exposition at Buffalo, on the day preceding his assassination, he said:

"We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us nor for those with whom we deal. . . . If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?"

The difficulty with our protective system as it affects the farmer is that, while industrial tariffs are usually 100 per cent effective and operate to raise the farmer's costs, the major portion of American agriculture, under present conditions, can not be brought under the protective system. For generations the growers of our staple crops have been thrown into merciless competition with the cheapest labor in the world, while being compelled by the action of the Government to buy their supplies in a highly protected market. The higher we make the rates on commodities which farmers in common with the rest of our population must buy the less chance there is for the economic survival of those branches of our agriculture which can not be brought under the protective system.

We warmly commend the Senate for its action in incorporating the export debenture amendment in the tariff bill. The retention of this feature of the bill will mean more to agriculture than many farm rates it contains, which we know in advance will be partially or wholly ineffective. It can not be too strongly emphasized that it will be economically impossible for agriculture to continue indefinitely to pay the higher costs occasioned by the tariff unless it receives corresponding benefits from the protective system. In supporting the debenture plan the Grange does not ask for any gratuity or special favor for agriculture. We are asking for simple justice and fair play. The principal beneficiaries of the protective system should be willing to approve this plan. As Senator BORAH said in his speech on the debenture proposal

on the floor of the Senate last June, "unless the protective tariff applies and can be made to apply as a system to the Nation as a whole, then it becomes a special privilege, the result of governmental favor, and is intolerable."

From the beginning of the long fight for equality for agriculture the friends of the farmer, both in and out of Congress, have steadfastly declared that we must make the tariff effective on our surplus crops in order to remedy the ills of agriculture. The debenture amendment contains the only proposal pending before the present Congress which is intended to accomplish this. In recent months the price of wheat, cotton, dairy and poultry products, and other farm commodities has been lower than at any time since the World War. At the same time farm costs have been maintained at high levels, principally by existing tariff rates on industrial commodities. As a matter of fundamental justice we strongly urge the House to concur in the debenture amendment.

Sincerely yours,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
FRED BRECKMAN,
Washington Representative.

RELIEF OF FARMERS IN CERTAIN STATES

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10818) to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 47, Seventy-first Congress, entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm, flood, and/or drought stricken areas of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Ohio, Oklahoma, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, New Mexico, and Missouri."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the big idea?

Mr. LEAVITT. The situation is that the seed loan bill, which has already passed the House and Senate, and for which an appropriation has already been made, is found to be so worded that it will not allow the purchase of fuel oil for farmers in some sections that use small tractors instead of horses. It would, in effect, allow a man who farms on one side of the fence with horses to get the benefit while the farmer on the other side who uses a tractor, and who needs relief in the same way, would be denied the benefit. It comes with a favorable report from the Secretary of Agriculture, calling it an emergency matter, and it has had the unanimous action of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, a favorable report from the Department of Agriculture on bills of this kind makes absolutely no impression upon me. I recall that when this bill was passed there were a great many Members on the floor and it seemed then the bill was perfect. The other day we tried to get an appropriation for Porto Rico but this House howled it down.

Mr. LEAVITT. Of course, that may have been a mistake. I had this bill up earlier in the afternoon, and there was some objection and some question about it. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman who objected and he has withdrawn his objection. It is a matter of real emergency.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You are not going to buy oil for the tractors to-morrow or within the next few days.

Mr. LEAVITT. The situation is that the organization to put this into effect is already on its way to Grand Forks.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This bill has not passed the Senate as yet.

Mr. LEAVITT. It has been considered in the committee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Senate is not in session, so let it go over until Monday. I shall object for the present.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is the purpose of the gentleman to take up the tariff bill on Monday, as I understand. Could the gentleman give me some idea as to when we are going to reach the Private Calendar again?

Mr. SNELL. I can not say definitely, but within a short time.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have no objection to the request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, following the question which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr.

EDWARDS] asked and answered himself, does the gentleman propose to take up the tariff bill Monday?

Mr. SNELL. I think it is somewhat doubtful.

Mr. GARNER. It is a question whether consideration of the tariff bill will be brought up Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. SNELL. It will be Monday or Tuesday, and I think now it will be Tuesday.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Would the gentleman say positively that it will be Tuesday?

Mr. SNELL. Not positively.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. The gentleman is not even positive about Tuesday?

Mr. SNELL. I can not say positively, because there has not been any decision.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. It will not be Monday?

Mr. SNELL. At the present time, I think not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6120. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat., 630); the act entitled "An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes,' approved May 25, 1926," dated February 24, 1928 (45 Stat., 137); and the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as space for public buildings," approved January 13, 1928 (45 Stat., 51).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, March 28, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider private bills.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Legislative appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

To create a body corporate by the name of The Textile Alliance Foundation (H. R. 9557).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 178. A resolution to provide for the expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency in carrying out the provisions of H. Res. 141 (Rept. No. 1003). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOWELL: Committee on Roads. H. R. 10037. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1928; with amendment (Rept. No. 1009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 5662. A bill providing for depositing certain moneys into the reclamation fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 1010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 187. A resolution to pay Amanda A. Richmond, widow of James E. Richmond, six months' compensation and an additional \$250 to

defray funeral expenses and last illness of said James E. Richmond (Rept. No. 1004). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GUYER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 471. A bill for the relief of Luther W. Guerin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11088. A bill for the refund of money erroneously collected from Thomas Griffith, of Peach Creek, W. Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11132. A bill for the relief of Edward Knight; with amendment (Rept. No. 1007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 11113. A bill for the relief of the widows and wife of certain Foreign Service officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 11190) to exempt from the quota husbands of American citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 11191) to amend and supplement an act entitled "An act to amend the salary rates contained in the compensation schedules of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled 'An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services,' approved May 28, 1928, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 11192) to provide for the retirement of disabled nurses of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11193) to amend section 23, of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11194) to determine the contribution of the United States to the expenses of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 11195) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," as amended; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11196) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Clarendon, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 11197) to provide for a term of court at Ponca City, Okla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 11198) granting the consent of Congress to the board of county road commissioners of Wayne County, Mich., to reconstruct, maintain, and operate as a free highway bridge the existing railroad bridge across the American channel of the Detroit River, leading from the mainland to Grosse Isle, Mich., and about 16 miles below the city of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 11199) to amend sections 22 and 39, Title II, of the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 11200) to provide for the acquisition, sale, and closer settlement of delinquent lands on irrigation projects by the Government to protect its investment; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 11201) to authorize a preliminary examination of the Fox River, Wis., for the purpose of flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 11202) to provide for the erection of a suitable monument to the memory of David Wilmot, author of the Wilmot proviso; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 11203) to ratify certain leases with the Seneca Nation of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 11204) to regulate the entry of persons into the United States, to establish a border patrol in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 283) making additional appropriations for certain expenses under the Depart-

ment of Justice for the remainder of the fiscal year 1930; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 11205) for the relief of Moody A. Howell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 11206) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11207) for the relief of Ceylon Gowdy, otherwise known as Ceylon G. Andrews; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 11208) granting a pension to Mary Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 11209) granting a pension to Eunice C. McGarvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11210) granting a pension to Esther Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 11211) granting an increase of pension to Harold A. Canon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11212) to recognize the high public service rendered by James C. Burke in voluntarily submitting himself for a test in an effort to discover the cause and means of transmission of malarial fever; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 11213) for the relief of John J. Hannigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11214) for the relief of Joseph Schattan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 11215) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. C. Vanderhoop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11216) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Hulett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGORY: A bill (H. R. 11217) granting a pension to Lucretia E. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALSEY: A bill (H. R. 11218) granting an increase of pension to Emily S. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11219) granting an increase of pension to Letta A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 11220) granting a pension to Margaret R. Frier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 11221) granting a pension to Waldo E. Stucker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 11222) granting a pension to Navar Combs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 11223) granting a pension to Margaret E. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 11224) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Tillett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: A bill (H. R. 11225) granting an increase of pension to William H. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 11226) for the relief of William F. Bourland; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 11227) granting an increase of pension to Ophelia F. Lyons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6094. By Mr. ADKINS: Petition of citizens of Moweaqua, Shelby County, Ill., requesting speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6095. By Mr. ALMON: Petition of J. R. Crow, route No. 2, box 156, Decatur, Ala., in behalf of the bill pending in Congress providing for an increase of pensions for the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6096. By Mr. BOYLAN: Letter from the New York State Federation of Labor, at Albany, N. Y., favoring the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6097. Also, letter from the Warehousemen's Association of the Port of New York (Inc.), New York City, favoring House bill 10418; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6098. By Mr. BRUNNER: Petition of some of the citizens of Queens County, N. Y., indorsing House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, and urging Congress to speedily pass these measures; to the Committee on Pensions.

6099. By Mr. CARTER of Wyoming: Petition of citizens of Buffalo, Wyo., favoring House bill 2562, granting an increase of pension to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6100. By Mr. DRANE: Petition of citizens of the first congressional district of Florida, in support of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

6101. By Mr. DOXEY: Petition of John W. McCracken and others, of Sardis, Miss., urging speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, providing for increase in pensions to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6102. By Mr. ESLICK: Resolution of the common council, city of Pulaski, Tenn., in behalf of General Pulaski memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6103. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of nine citizens of Forest, Idaho, protesting against proposed calendar change of weekly cycle in connection with House Joint Resolution 334; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6104. By Mr. FULMER: Resolutions passed by the American Legion Auxiliary Post, No. 10, Charleston, S. C., in behalf of House bill 9411, proposing to establish a veterans' hospital in South Carolina; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6105. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Bennett Harding and 23 other citizens of Crittenden County, Ky., urging the speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6106. By Mr. HALSEY: Petition of H. W. Austin and other citizens of El Dorado Springs, Mo., for passage of the Robson-Capper free public school bill, which will establish a national department of public education, with its head a member of the President's Cabinet; to the Committee on Education.

6107. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition from citizens of Flint and Milford, Mich., urging the passage of House bill 2562 providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6108. By Mr. JOHNSON of Nebraska: Petition of 71 veterans and citizens of Nuckolls County, Nebr., urging speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6109. Also, petition of Business Men's Forum, Bertrand, Nebr., in support of Sears bill (H. R. 9376); to the Committee on Flood Control.

6110. By Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Uniontown, Pa., urging favorable action on legislation increasing the pensions of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6111. By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Petition of Joseph J. Bardgett and 60 other citizens of St. Louis and St. Louis County, urging speedy consideration of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562 providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6112. By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: Petition of Clyde Parkinson and 29 other citizens of Tulsa County, Okla., urging prompt action on legislation for the further relief of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6113. By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Petition of Phil F. Voelker and others, of Evansville, Ind., that Congress enact into law legislation providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6114. By Mr. SCHNEIDER: Petition by citizens of Outagamie County, Wis., urging the speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, providing increased rates of pension to the veterans of the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6115. By Mr. SHORT of Missouri: Petition of citizens of Stoddard County, Mo., urging the passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, to increase the pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6116. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of the members of Oneida Tribe, No. 91, Improved Order of Red Men,

of Olcott, W. Va., favoring the passage of the Capper-Robson free public school bill; to the Committee on Education.

6117. By Mr. STONE: Petition of 32 citizens of Kingfisher, Okla., asking Congress to pass favorably on House bill 9233, to prescribe a certain prohibition oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6118. Also, petition of 43 citizens from Mooreland, Okla., asking Congress to pass favorably on House bill 9233, to prescribe a certain prohibition oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6119. Also, petition of 17 citizens of Oklahoma City, Okla., asking Congress to pass favorably on House bill 9233, to prescribe a certain prohibition oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6120. Also, petition of 82 citizens of Alva, Okla., asking Congress to pass favorably on House bill 9233, to prescribe a certain prohibition oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6121. Also, petition of Woman's Relief Corps of Oklahoma, asking Congress to pass favorably on House bill 8765, introduced by Mr. STOBBS; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6122. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of J. M. Bennett and 66 citizens, asking for the passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, for increased pensions for Spanish-American veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6123. By Mr. WOLFENDEN: Petition of West Chester Lodge No. 908, Loyal Order Moose, West Chester, Pa., praying for passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, to increase pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6124. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of the North Takoma Improvement Club, of Takoma Park, in reference to House bill 10813, the District appropriation bill, and the elimination of the item of \$211,000 for the construction of a viaduct to eliminate the dangerous grade crossing at Fern and Chestnut Streets NW.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

FRIDAY, March 28, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. Z^cBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art always more ready to hear than we to pray, and who lovest every soul of man more than a mother loves her child, give us the inward grace to utilize for every need the impact of all outward things, the glowing love enriched by service, the generous mind that sees with a thousand eyes though others be dim-sighted, and the reverence that arms with courage as we face the duties of another day. Bless our fair land with every element of good, that sheltered by Thy fostering care we may approve ourselves a nation void of offense, and in this hour of serving Thee may discern in the crises of our times Thy judgments, in the growing demand for righteousness the coming of Thy kingdom. All of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 25, 1930, when, upon request of Mr. McNARY and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6120) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stats. 630); the act entitled "An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes,' approved May 25, 1926," dated February 24, 1928 (45 Stats. 137); and the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain land within the District of Columbia to be used as space for public buildings," approved January 13, 1928 (45 Stats. 51).

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5616) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4293. An act to provide for a ferry and a highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 7968. An act granting the consent of Congress to agreements or compacts between the States of Oklahoma and Texas for the purchase, construction, and maintenance of highway bridges over the Red River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8293. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1929;

H. R. 8637. An act to fix the rank and pay of the Commandant of the Coast Guard;

H. R. 8807. An act to provide for the coordination of the public-health activities of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10583. An act to provide for the method of measurement of vessels using the Panama Canal; and

H. R. 10813. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 3371. An act to amend section 88 of the Judicial Code, as amended;

H. R. 3657. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain lands in Custer County, Nebr.;

H. R. 6120. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630); the act entitled "An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes,' approved May 25, 1926," dated February 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 137); and the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as space for public buildings," approved January 13, 1928 (45 Stat. 51);

H. R. 11045. An act to increase the appropriation for the acquisition of a site for the new House Office Building; and

H. J. Res. 264. Joint resolution making an appropriation to complete the restoration of the frigate *Constitution*.

PETITIONS

Mr. BRATTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Tajique, N. Mex., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to veterans of the war with Spain, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Vickery, Tex., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to veterans of the war with Spain, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens (ladies) of Georgetown, Tex., praying for the passage of the so-called Brookhart bill, being the bill (S. 1003) to prevent the obstruction of and burdens upon interstate trade and commerce in copyrighted motion-picture films, and to prevent restraint upon free competition in the production, distribution, and exhibition of copyrighted motion-picture films, and to prevent the further monopolization of the business of producing, distributing, and exhibiting copyrighted motion-picture films (a) by prohibiting the blind booking and block booking of copyrighted motion-picture films; (b) by prohibiting the arbitrary allocation of such films by producers and distributors to theaters in which they have no interest; (c) by making unlawful the arbitrary refusal by producers or distributors to furnish such films to theaters in which they have no interest; (d) and by making unlawful any system for the arbitration of disputes arising out of the lease or license of such films which is imposed on the exhibitor against his will and/or which is enforced by the coercive action of producers or distributors not parties to the dispute, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A bill (S. 4027) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Road Commissioners of Wayne County, Mich., to reconstruct, maintain, and operate as a free highway bridge the existing railroad bridge across the American channel of the Detroit River, leading from the mainland to Grosse Isle, Mich., and about 16 miles below the city of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4028) to amend the Federal farm loan act as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.